

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JEROME ROBERT FELDER,

Defendant and Appellant.

B234329

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BA373752)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Ronald S. Coen, Judge. Affirmed.

Suzan E. Hier, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant Jerome Robert Felder appeals from the judgment entered after his no contest plea to one count of second degree robbery. His appointed counsel filed a *Wende* brief. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) On November 8, 2011, we directed appointed counsel to send the record and a copy of the brief to defendant and notified him of his right to respond within 30 days. We received no response.

The record does not include a certificate of probable cause, and defendant's notice of appeal states that it is based upon the sentence or other matters that arose after entry of the plea that do not affect the validity of the plea. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.304(b)(4).) We have reviewed the whole record under *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, focusing upon the sentence as that is the only matter that arose after entry of the plea.

Defendant and his codefendant were charged by information filed on August 17, 2010 with second degree robbery for snatching a pedestrian's purse on July 16, 2010. (Pen.Code, § 211.)¹ The information also alleged that defendant had suffered two prior strike convictions (§§ 667, subd. (b)-(i), 1170.12, subd. (a)-(d)). The same convictions were alleged for purposes of section 667, subdivision (a). The prison terms defendant served on these convictions were alleged for purposes of section 667.5, subdivision (b).

On May 9, 2011, defendant entered into a plea agreement that required him to plead no contest to robbery and to admit one of the two strike priors and two section 667, subdivision (a) enhancements, for a total sentence of 20 years. He was sentenced according to this agreement and was awarded 342 days of custody credit (298 days of actual credit and 44 days of conduct credit). The court imposed a restitution fine of \$200 and an additional \$200 suspended parole revocation restitution fine. (§§ 1202.4, subd. (b), 1202.45). Additionally, the court assessed a \$40 court security fee and a \$30 criminal conviction assessment fee. (§ 1465.8, subd. (a)(1); Gov. Code, § 70373.)

Having reviewed the record, we are satisfied that no arguable issues for appeal exist.

¹ All subsequent references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise indicated.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

EPSTEIN, P. J.

We concur:

MANELLA, J.

SUZUKAWA, J.