

Filed 1/8/26 P. v. Reynoso CA2/2

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JOSE REYNOSO,

Defendant and Appellant.

B342889

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No.  
24BFCF00363-01)

THE COURT:

Jose Reynoso appeals his conviction of grand theft (Pen. Code,<sup>1</sup> § 487, subd. (a)). His appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) identifying no issues. Counsel sent a notice to Reynoso's address of record to inform him of his right to file a supplemental brief, but the mail was returned as undeliverable. Counsel has indicated he lacks Reynoso's current address, as Reynoso has

---

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

been released from jail and is not under any supervision. Because Reynoso has failed to provide his current contact information, we conclude that the notice sent to his address of record was adequate. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.32(a)–(b)(1).) We have reviewed the record and, finding no arguable issues, affirm the judgment.

Reynoso was charged by felony complaint of grand theft (§ 487, subd. (a)). The matter proceeded to trial by jury, and the jury found him guilty as charged. The trial court found three aggravating factors true under California Rules of Court, rule 4.421. It sentenced Reynoso to a total of three years in county jail, denied probation, and gave him credit for time served. Reynoso filed a timely notice of appeal.

The evidence at trial showed that on the evening of August 11, 2023, Reynoso and his codefendant Alexander Leon stole some expensive boxes of Legos from Target. A security guard saw the theft and called the police, who then promptly located the men carrying the boxes of Legos. Reynoso complied with the officer's directive to put his hands on the hood of the police vehicle, and Leon ran away.

Having examined the record, we are satisfied that Reynoso's counsel has complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.) We conclude that Reynoso has, by virtue of counsel's compliance and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment entered against him in this case. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123–124.)

The judgment is affirmed.  
NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

---

LUI, P. J.

CHAVEZ, J.

RICHARDSON, J.