

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DARRYL PIERRE CRAWFORD,

Defendant and Appellant.

D085321, D085322

(Super. Ct. Nos. RIF1101501,
RIF150644)

CONSOLIDATED APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of
Riverside County, Samuel Diaz, Jr., Judge. Affirmed.

Darryl Pierre Crawford, in pro. per.; and Lizabeth Weis, under
appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

This consolidated appeal involves the denial of petitions for
resentencing, and it is subject to the process mandated by *People v.*
Delgadillo (2022) 14 Cal.5th 216.

In June 2010, after a retrial, Crawford was convicted of two counts of assault with a deadly weapon (Pen. Code,¹ § 245, subd. (a)(1)) and one count of criminal threat (§ 422) in Superior Court case No. RIF150644. The court suspended execution of the sentence and released Crawford from custody. But he was later taken into custody.

In 2011, in Superior Court case No. RIF1101501, Crawford was convicted of several felonies including two counts of attempted murder (§§ 187, subd. (a) & 664) and personally using a deadly weapon (§ 12022, subd. (b)(1)). The court later recalled the sentence and held a new sentencing hearing at which it sentenced Crawford in both superior court cases. It sentenced Crawford to an aggregate term of 29 years to life in prison.

In 2024, Crawford filed petitions for resentencing under sections 1170.91 and 1172.1.

The court appointed counsel, held a hearing and ultimately denied the petitions.

Crawford filed timely notices of appeal.

Appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Delgadillo* indicating counsel has not been able to identify any potentially meritorious issues for reversal on appeal. Counsel asks the court to exercise the discretion granted by *Delgadillo* to independently review the record for error. We advised Crawford of his right to file his own brief on appeal. Crawford has filed a supplemental brief.

We have reviewed Crawford's supplemental brief. He challenges his sentence for two counts of assault with a deadly weapon that was imposed in 2011. Crawford notes he was released at one point on a suspended sentence. He believes that release had the effect of reducing the assault convictions to

¹ All statutory references are to the Penal Code.

misdemeanors. On the record presented in this appeal, Crawford has not identified any potentially meritorious issues for reversal on appeal.

DISCUSSION

As we have noted, appellate counsel has filed a *Delgadillo* brief and asks the court to independently review the record for error. To assist the court in its review, and in compliance with *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel has identified a possible issue that was considered in evaluating the potential merits of this appeal: Whether the trial court abused its discretion by denying Crawford's request for resentencing under sections 1170.91 and 1172.1.

We have exercised our discretion to independently review the record for error. Our review has not identified any potentially meritorious issues for reversal on appeal. Competent counsel has represented Crawford on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The orders denying Crawford's petitions for resentencing are affirmed.

HUFFMAN, J.*

WE CONCUR:

McCONNELL, P. J.

DO, J.

* Retired Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.