

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LARON WILLIAMS,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B255344
(Super. Ct. No. 14PT-00047)
(San Luis Obispo County)

Laron Williams was convicted of inflicting corporal injury on his spouse (Pen. Code, § 273.5, subd. (a))¹ and sentenced to a term in state prison. He appeals from an order denying his section 2966, subdivision (b) petition for review of the determination of the Board of Prison Terms (BPT) that appellant meets the criteria of a mentally disordered offender (MDO), and committing him to the Department of Mental Health for treatment for a period of one year. (§ 2962 et seq.) We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal.

Appointed counsel has filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings in the trial court. Counsel presents no argument for reversal concerning the order committing appellant for treatment as an MDO and requests that we review the commitment proceedings pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders*

¹ All statutory references are to the Penal Code.

v. California (1967) 386 U.S. 738. In making this request, counsel notes that in *People v. Taylor* (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th 304, 312 (*Taylor*), the Second Appellate District considered whether the *Wende/Anders* procedures were applicable to MDO commitment cases and concluded they were not. In accordance with *Taylor*, we decline to apply *Wende/Anders* procedures to this MDO case.

On June 12, 2014, appointed counsel sent appellant copies of the opening brief and record on appeal. On June 16, 2014, we sent appellant a letter informing him of his right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days raising any issues he wishes the court to consider. We have received no communication from appellant.

Appointed counsel having found no arguable issues and appellant having declined to file a supplemental brief, dismissal is appropriate pursuant to *Taylor, supra*, 160 Cal.App.4th at page 313.

The appeal is dismissed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

PERREN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

YEGAN, J.

Teresa Estrada-Mullaney, Judge

Superior Court County of San Luis Obispo

Gerald J. Miller, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.