

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

BRADY ANDERSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

F088879

(Super. Ct. No. DF018110A)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Kern County. Brian M. McNamara, Judge.

Ashwini Mate, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Office of the State Attorney General, Sacramento, California, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Detjen, Acting P. J., Franson, J. and Harrell, J.

THE COURT

Appointed counsel for defendant Brady Anderson (defendant) asked this court to review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (See *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Counsel filed an opening brief setting forth the case's relevant facts.

Defendant was advised of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we affirm the judgment.

BACKGROUND

On February 26, 2024, Officer Enrique Escobedo of the Delano Police Department was on patrol for the investigation of a stolen vehicle when he saw the vehicle in a gas station's parking lot. Escobedo broadcasted his finding over the radio dispatch, and Officer Hector Diaz, who was nearby, initiated a traffic stop on the vehicle. Defendant was driving the vehicle which, at the time, did not have any noticeable damage. As Escobedo joined the traffic stop, the vehicle reversed into an alleyway and drove off. A pursuit ensued. After about six miles, the vehicle made a "U-turn" and "charged" at Diaz before driving into oncoming traffic at a speed of approximately 80 to 100 miles per hour. The pursuit was then canceled.

Soon after, the McFarland Police Department found the vehicle empty and stuck in a dirt lot about a mile and a half away. The Kern County Sheriff's Department was also involved in the investigation. Using a "drone" and a K9 unit, law enforcement found defendant on top of a train car nearby and placed him under arrest.

On May 22, 2024, the District Attorney of Kern County filed an information charging defendant with receiving a stolen vehicle (Pen. Code,¹ § 496d, subd. (a);

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise noted.

count 1), driving a vehicle without consent (Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a); count 2), evading an officer and driving against traffic (Veh. Code, § 2800.4; count 3), driving a car with willful and wanton disregard for safety of people and property (Veh. Code, § 2800.2; count 4), misdemeanor resisting an officer (§ 148, subd. (a)(1); count 5), misdemeanor reckless driving (Veh. Code, § 23103, subd. (a); count 6), failing to stop at an intersection (Veh. Code, § 22450, subd. (a); count 7), and driving at an unsafe speed (Veh. Code, § 22350; count 8). As to counts 1 and 2, the information alleged defendant had previously been convicted of possession of stolen vehicle (§ 666.5). It was also alleged as to counts 1 through 4 that defendant had three prior “strike” convictions within the meaning of the “Three Strikes” law (§§ 667, subds. (b)–(i), 1170.12, subds. (a)–(d)).²

On July 8, 2024, before trial, defendant requested the trial court to substitute his counsel under *Marsden*.³ After the court denied that request, defendant requested to represent himself and completed a *Faretta*⁴ form. The court granted his request of self-representation. On July 24, 2024, at defendant’s request, the court reappointed counsel to represent him.

On September 20, 2024, a jury convicted defendant of counts 1 through 6. Counts 7 and 8 were dismissed on the People’s motion. Defendant requested a bifurcated court trial on the prior strike allegations and aggravating circumstances. On September 24, 2024, the trial court found defendant suffered one prior strike and found the section 666.5 allegation true. The court also found true four aggravating circumstances.

On October 23, 2024, the trial court sentenced defendant to an aggregate term of seven years four months as follows: on count 1, six years (the middle term of three years

² The information was later amended on September 24, 2024. In addition to the aforementioned charges and allegations, the amended information also alleged multiple circumstances in aggravation under California Rules of Court, rule 4.421(b).

³ *People v. Marsden* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 118.

⁴ *Faretta v. California* (1975) 422 U.S. 806.

doubled due to the prior strike conviction); and on count 4, a consecutive term of 16 months (one-third the middle term). The remaining counts were stayed under section 654.

This appeal timely followed.

DISCUSSION

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no evidence of any arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.