

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ULIS MORRIS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B233049

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BA377891)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Frederick N. Wapner, Judge. Affirmed.

Carey D. Gorden, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

A jury convicted defendant Ullis Morris of one count of robbery. The trial court sentenced him to three years in state prison. Defendant appeals from the judgment of conviction.

The evidence at trial showed that on July 17, 2010, Amy Langley-Larson (Larson) went bar hopping with a female friend in Hollywood. Later, at a pizza parlor, her cell phone was taken from her table. Defendant and two other people (a Hispanic man and a blonde woman) offered to help her get it back. After calling her cell phone, they led Larson to the Gilbert Motel to obtain her phone. While there, the blonde girl said that Larson could come up to their room to get her phone. Larson refused, and started walking away. Defendant and the other two walked with her to the corner, and then defendant grabbed Larson's purse. Larson struggled, but was knocked to the ground. Defendant fled with the purse.

After reviewing the record, appellant's court-appointed counsel filed an opening brief asking this court to review the record independently pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.

On March 2, 2012, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that no arguable issues exist, and that appellant has, by virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment entered against him in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 112-113.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

WILLHITE, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P. J.

SUZUKAWA, J.