

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

**THE PEOPLE,**

**Plaintiff and Respondent,**

**A134086**

**v.**

**(Lake County  
Super. Ct. No. CR926141**

**JANE DEE CORBETT,**

**Defendant and Appellant.**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Appellant Jane Dee Corbett appeals from a judgment entered after she pleaded no contest to possessing methamphetamine for purposes of sale. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11378.) Her counsel on appeal has filed an opening brief that asks this court to conduct an independent review of the record as is required by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Counsel also informed appellant that she had the right to file a supplemental brief on her own behalf. Appellant declined to exercise that right.

On March 24, 2011, sheriff's deputies serving a search warrant entered appellant's home in Lake County. They found 6.2 grams of methamphetamine hidden in a soda can, two scales, several unused plastic bags and a substantial amount of cash.

Based on this incident an information was filed charging appellant with the offense we have set forth above. As is relevant here, the information also alleged appellant had a prior conviction for possessing a controlled substance for purposes of sale

(Health & Saf. Code, § 11370.2, subd. (c)), and had served a prior prison term. (Pen. Code, § 667.5, subd. (b).)

The case was resolved through negotiation. Appellant pleaded no contest to possessing methamphetamine for purposes of sale and admitted the prior controlled substance conviction and the prior prison term. In exchange, other counts and allegations were dismissed.

Subsequently, the court sentenced appellant to the upper term of three years for possessing methamphetamine for purposes of sale, plus three years for the prior controlled substance conviction and one year for the prior prison term.

We have reviewed the record on appeal and conclude there are no meritorious issues to be argued. Before accepting appellant's plea, the court made sure appellant understood the constitutional rights she was waiving. The court also made sure appellant understood the consequences of her plea. We see no error in the sentence. Appellant was effectively represented by counsel.

We conclude there are no arguable issues within the meaning of *People v. Wende*, *supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436. (See also *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106.)

The judgment is affirmed.

---

Jones, P.J.

We concur:

---

Needham, J.

---

Bruiniers, J.