

Filed 12/30/25 P. v. Manes CA2/1

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,  Plaintiff and Respondent,  v.  DEAN EDWARD MANES,  Defendant and Appellant.	B344190  (Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. MA077578)
--	--

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Robert G. Chu, Judge. Affirmed.

Roberta Simon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

Defendant Dean Edward Manes appeals from his felony vandalism conviction after his plea of nolo contendere. Defendant's appointed appellate counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), identifying no issues and requesting this court to review the record and determine whether any arguable issue exists on appeal. We have done so and affirm.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **1. *Preliminary Hearing Testimony***

Evidence at the preliminary hearing showed that on November 4, 2019, defendant knocked over several items in a store causing damage in an amount over \$2200. Defendant also hit the store owner, causing him to suffer a black eye.

Defendant's conduct occurred after the store owner refused to purchase items defendant was trying to sell.

### **2. *Information***

On December 3, 2019, the People charged defendant with vandalism over \$400 (Pen. Code,<sup>1</sup>§ 594, subd. (a)) and battery (§ 242). The People alleged one prior serious or violent felony within the meaning of the Three Strike Law (§§ 667, subds. (b)-(j), 1170.12). The People alleged one prior conviction within the meaning of section 667.5, subdivision (b).

### **3. *Plea***

On December 27, 2024, defendant pled nolo contendere to the vandalism count. Among other rights, defendant expressly gave up the right to a "speedy jury trial." His counsel concurred in the plea.

---

<sup>1</sup> Undesignated statutory citations are to the Penal Code.

On the same day, the court sentenced defendant to the low term of 16 months. Defendant was given credit for 500 days, thus exceeding the sentence imposed. Among other conditions, the court issued a stay-away order, imposed fines and fees, and assessed victim restitution of \$2,093.31. The People dismissed the remaining count.

On February 21, 2025, defendant filed in pro per a notice of appeal. The notice of appeal states that he is appealing the conviction because of a “speedy trial violation.” Defendant did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

## **DISCUSSION**

Defendant’s appellate counsel filed a brief identifying no issue and requested this court review the record pursuant to *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436. On October 17, 2025, this court notified defendant he may submit a supplemental brief. Defendant did not file a supplemental brief, but prior to his appellate counsel filing a brief, defendant wrote a letter stating his right to a speedy trial had been violated.

A guilty plea “‘forecloses any further inquiry into whether there has been a deprivation of a defendant’s speedy trial right.’” (*People v. Sanders* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 839, 847.) “Thus, a guilty plea forecloses a defendant from asserting on appeal a claimed violation of the constitutional right to a speedy trial.” (*Ibid.*)

Because the record does not contain a certificate of probable cause, and defendant did not file a motion to suppress evidence under section 1538.5, our review is limited to “[t]he sentence or other matters occurring after the plea or admission that do not

affect the validity of the plea or admission.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.304(b)(2)(B).)

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that counsel has complied with counsel’s responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110–111; *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

## **DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.**

BENDIX, Acting P. J.

We concur:

WEINGART, J.

M. KIM, J.