

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

GAIL EVELYN ADAMS  
BARROCA,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B342524  
(Super. Ct. No. 18CR01674)  
(Santa Barbara County)

Gail Evelyn Adams Barroca appeals from an order terminating her probation and sentencing her to three years in county jail.

Barroca was charged with two counts of forgery against an elder by a caretaker (Pen. Code,<sup>1</sup> § 368, subd. (e); counts 1 & 2), two counts of second degree commercial burglary (§ 459; counts 3 & 4), grand theft of personal property (§ 487, subd. (a); count 5), dissuading a witness from reporting a crime (§ 136.1, subd. (b)(1);

---

<sup>1</sup> Unspecified statutory references are to the Penal Code.

count 6), sending a threatening letter for extortion (§ 523; count 7), theft from an elder by a caretaker (§ 368, subd. (e); count 8), and misdemeanor identifying information theft (§ 530.5, subd. (c)(1); count 9.) She pleaded no contest to count 2, and pursuant to the plea agreement, she was granted two years' probation. Barroca was also ordered to pay victim restitution to Wells Fargo Bank for \$28,492 and \$2,500 to Deborah Sanchez, at \$214 per month.

In August 2023, Barroca was found in violation of her probation for failure to pay restitution. Her probation was revoked and reinstated with modified terms, including that she disclose sources of income to her probation officer on a monthly basis, apply money not required for necessities towards restitution, and maintain one personal checking account.

In January 2024, the prosecutor filed an amended notice that Barroca violated probation by leaving her residence without prior approval on three occasions, failing to pay restitution, and failing to apply money not required for necessities towards restitution debt. The prosecutor also filed a supplemental probation violation report asserting that Barroca failed to comply with the financial accounting terms of her probation, including maintaining one personal checking account.

Following a hearing, the trial court found Barroca in violation of probation. The court terminated her probation and sentenced her to the middle term of three years in county jail with 97 days of credit.

We appointed counsel to represent Barroca in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On October 6, 2025, we advised Barroca that she had 30 days within which to personally submit

any contentions or issues that she wished to raise on appeal. We have not received a response.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that counsel has fully complied with their responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

BALTODANO, J.

We concur:

YEGAN, Acting P. J.

CODY, J.

Jean M. Dandona, Judge

Superior Court County of Santa Barbara

---

Michele A. Douglass, under appointment by the Court of  
Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.