

Filed 12/8/25 P. v. Vallejo CA2/5

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

ENRIQUE VALLEJO,

Defendant and Appellant.

B343877

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No.
BA513059)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Deborah S. Brazil, Judge. Affirmed.

Jennifer Peabody and Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant Enrique Vallejo (defendant) pled no contest to driving under the influence of alcohol causing injury (Veh. Code, § 23153(b)) and admitted to having a blood alcohol concentration of .20 percent or more (Veh. Code, § 23538(b)(2)). Imposition of sentence was suspended, and the trial court placed defendant on probation for five years subject to certain conditions.¹

When defendant failed to report to his probation officer, the trial court revoked probation and issued a bench warrant. Defendant later admitted a probation violation “for failing to report to probation as ordered and failing to complete . . . mandatory obligations of probation . . .” The trial court terminated probation and sentenced defendant to the mid-term of two years in state prison.

Defendant appealed, and this Court appointed counsel to represent him.² After examining the record, defendant’s attorney on appeal filed an opening brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 that raises no issues and asks us to independently review the record. Defendant’s attorney also submitted a declaration explaining defendant was released from prison before the attorney was appointed and he had no current contact information for defendant. This Court contacted defendant’s trial attorney, who was also unable to provide contact information for defendant, and sent defendant a letter at his last

¹ Defendant was ordered, among other things, to serve 90 days in county jail, to make restitution to any victim, and to complete an alcohol treatment program.

² Prior to briefing, the Administrative Presiding Justice of this Court issued an order limiting the appeal to issues that do not require a certificate of probable cause.

known address. Defendant has not responded to the letter, provided updated contact information (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.32), or submitted any contentions or issues for us to consider.

We have examined the appellate record and determined that defendant's attorney 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; *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

BAKER, Acting P. J.

We concur:

MOOR, J.

KIM (D.), J.