Filed 8/14/15 P. v. Henderson CA1/4

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. LAMOND S. HENDERSON, Defendant and Appellant.	A144775 (Contra Costa County Super. Ct. No. 5-020218-4; 2-291219-4)

Lamond S. Henderson appeals from a post-judgment order denying his motion to reduce the restitution fines imposed in his cases. His counsel raises no issues and asks this court for an independent review of the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was apprised of his right to file a supplemental brief, but did not do so.

On July 9, 2002, in case number 5-020218-4, the court, pursuant to a plea bargain, sentenced defendant to three years and 8 months in prison and imposed a mandatory restitution fine of $600 pursuant to Penal Code section 1202.4, subdivision (b)(2). On December 14, 2007, the court sentenced defendant in case number 2-201219-4 to 12 years in state prison on two counts of committing a lewd act to a minor (Penal Code, § 288, subd. (a)). In that matter, the court imposed a restitution fine of $2,400 pursuant to Penal Code section 1202.4, subdivision (b).

On January 20, 2015, defendant, in propria persona, filed a motion to modify his sentence, contending that the court erred in imposing the restitution fines because the court failed to consider his ability to pay. On February 9, 2015, the trial court denied the

motion, finding that it had no jurisdiction to grant the relief requested. The court further ruled that defendant failed to object to the imposition of the fines at the time he was sentenced and that the motion was untimely.

This court has reviewed the entire record and there are no meritorious issues to be argued.

The order is affirmed.

Rivera, J.

We concur:

Reardon, Acting P.J.

Streeter, J.