

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.111.5.
--

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

VALERIE D. OLMOS,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B283832
(Super. Ct. No. 2015038227)
(Ventura County)

Valerie D. Olmos appeals from the judgment entered after a jury convicted her of theft of property from an elder by a caretaker with special findings that the property was worth more than \$950 (count 1; Pen. Code, § 368, subd. (e)), possession of a controlled substance (count 2; Bus. & Prof. Code, § 4060), being under the influence of a controlled substance (count 3; Health & Saf. Code, § 11550, subd. (a)), and possession of drug paraphernalia (Health & Saf. Code, § 11364, subd. (a)). The trial court suspended imposition of sentence, granted three years probation with 240 days county jail, and ordered appellant to pay \$7,000 victim restitution and various fines and fees.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised.

On November 9, 2017, we advised appellant that she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues she wished us to consider. No response has been received.

The record shows that appellant stole jewelry from her patient, a 94 year old man suffering from dementia, and the patient's wife. The Ventura Police executed a search warrant at appellant's home, at which time appellant appeared to be under the influence of drugs and tested positive for methamphetamine. During the search, a meth pipe and Vicodin pills were found in appellant's bedroom. In a *Miranda* interview (*Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436), appellant admitted the pipe was hers and that she did not have a prescription for the Vicodin pills. It was later determined that appellant pawned some of the jewelry at a local pawn shop.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 443; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 126.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

YEGAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

TANGEMAN, J.

Nancy Ayers, Judge

Superior Court County of Ventura

Melcher & Melcher and William Paul Melcher for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.