

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

ROGER LAWRENCE BELL,

Defendant and Appellant.

D085884

(Super. Ct. No. SCE420852)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Frank L. Birchak, Judge. Affirmed.

Reed Webb, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Roger Lawrence Bell entered into a plea agreement with a stipulated sentence. Bell pleaded guilty to assault with a deadly weapon (Pen. Code,¹ § 245, subd. (a)(1)) with personally inflicting great bodily injury (§ 12022.7, subd. (b)) and assault with a semiautomatic firearm (§ 245, subd. (b)) and

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code.

admitted a strike prior (§ 667, subds. (b)–(i)). The remaining charges and allegations were dismissed and the parties stipulated to a determinate term of 20 years in prison. Bell was sentenced in accordance with the plea agreement.

Bell filed a timely notice of appeal and requested a certificate of probable cause which the trial court denied.

Appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and asks the court to independently review the record for error as mandated by *Wende*. We offered Bell the opportunity to file his own brief on appeal, but he has not responded.

It is not necessary to discuss the facts of the offenses in this case. Accordingly, we will not include a statement of facts in this opinion.

DISCUSSION

As we have noted, appellate counsel has filed a *Wende* 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 two possible issues that were considered in evaluating the potential merits of this appeal.

1. Whether it is possible the guilty pleas were coerced.
2. Whether the court erred in imposing a strike sentence based on a written agreement.

We have independently reviewed the record for error as required by *Wende* and *Anders*. We have not discovered any arguable issues for reversal on appeal. Competent counsel has represented Bell on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, J.*

WE CONCUR:

IRION, Acting 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.