

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ALFRED HAKOBYAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

B283279

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. GA096341)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Michael D. Carter, Judge. Affirmed as modified.

James Renteria, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

The Los Angeles County District Attorney charged defendant Alfred Hakobyan (defendant) in a three-count information with grand theft of personal property (count 1) and two counts of forgery relating to an item exceeding \$950 in value (counts 2 and 3). Briefly described, the charges against defendant were predicated on evidence that defendant, in 2014, deposited checks drawn on a defunct account and then withdrew \$11,878.79 before the bank where he deposited the funds learned the deposited checks were no good.

The jury convicted defendant on all three of the charged counts. The trial court sentenced defendant to sixteen months in county jail. Specifically, the court imposed the low term of sixteen months on each count and ordered that the sentences on counts two and three would run concurrently with the sentence on count one. The court gave defendant 41 days of credit toward his sentence (21 days actual and 20 days good time/work time) and orally imposed requisite fines and fees.

Defendant filed a notice of appeal, and this court appointed counsel to represent him. After examining the record, defense counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On September 21, 2017, this court advised defendant he had 30 days to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. We received no response.

We have examined the appellate record, and we are satisfied defendant's attorney on appeal has complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issue exists. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278-82; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 122-24; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.) We have discovered one minor error in the abstract of judgment,

however: it incorrectly states the date of defendant's conviction on count 3. We will order the error corrected.

DISPOSITION

The clerk of the superior court shall prepare an amended abstract of judgment that states defendant's conviction for forgery, as charged in count 3 of the information, occurred on March 15, 2017. The clerk shall deliver a copy of the amended abstract to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The judgment of conviction is affirmed as modified.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

BAKER, J.

We concur:

KRIEGLER, Acting P.J.

DUNNING, J.*

* Judge of the Orange Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.