

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

RYAN JAMES ANDRADE,

Defendant and Appellant.

B251829

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. PA077003)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Hayden Zacky, Judge. Affirmed.

California Appellate Project, Jonathan B. Steiner, Executive Director, and Richard B. Lennon, Staff Attorney, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

## FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The information charged defendant with having committed an assault with a deadly weapon (§ 245, subd. (a)(1))<sup>1</sup> in which he inflicted great bodily injury on the victim (§ 12022.7, subd. (a).) In addition, the information alleged five prior prison terms as enhancements (§ 667.5, subd. (b).)

Represented by counsel, defendant agreed to plead no contest to the charge and admit the great bodily injury enhancement in return for a six-year sentence. (*People v. West* (1970) 3 Cal.3d 595.) Defendant executed a four-page “Felony Advisement of Rights, Waiver, and Plea Form.” After the trial court orally advised him of his constitutional rights, defendant waived those rights and entered his plea and admission. Trial counsel joined in the waivers, concurred in the plea and stipulated to the factual basis of the plea. The trial court found that defendant had “expressly, knowingly, understandably and intelligently waived his constitutional rights with full knowledge of the consequences of his plea and admission. They were both freely and voluntarily made. There is a factual basis for each.”

The trial court imposed the agreed-upon six-year sentence: a three-year mid-term for the assault and a consecutive three-year term for the great bodily injury enhancement. The trial court granted the People’s motion to dismiss the prior prison term allegations.

Defendant filed a notice of appeal from the judgment.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> All statutory references are to the Penal Code.

Defendant was advised of his right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days raising any contentions 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 defendant 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.)

The judgment is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

WILLHITE, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P. J.

MANELLA, J.