

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LELAND CHATMAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

B233186

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. NA073807)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Charles D. Sheldon, Judge. Affirmed.

Randall Conner, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant Leland Chatman appeals from the judgment entered following resentencing upon remand after a prior appeal. Defendant's criminal threats and felon in possession of a firearm convictions stemmed from a 2007 incident in which he threatened his father's roommate after she evicted defendant's father.

In an unpublished opinion filed on September 29, 2009, we reversed the jury's gang enhancement findings for insufficiency of evidence and remanded for resentencing (B202934). The trial court resentenced defendant before remittitur issued, which necessitated reversal. In an unpublished opinion filed on November 19, 2010, we reversed and remanded with directions to resentence defendant, recalculate his actual custody credits through the date of the resentencing hearing, and issue an amended abstract of judgment reflecting that the firearm enhancement was found and imposed under subdivision (a) of Penal Code section 12022.5 (B221836).

Upon remand, the trial court sentenced defendant to 8 years 8 months in prison. It recalculated defendant's credits through the date of the resentencing hearing, and issued an amended abstract of judgment, as directed. Defendant again appealed.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. On April 5, 2012, we advised defendant he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

MALLANO, P. J.

We concur:

CHANEY, J.

JOHNSON, J.