

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Shasta)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MICHELLE LYNN MARTINEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

C067322

(Super. Ct. No. 10F3962)

This case comes to us pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) and *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110 (*Kelly*). Having reviewed the record as required by *Wende*, we affirm the judgment.

We provide the following brief description of the facts and procedural history of the case. (*Kelly, supra*, 40 Cal.4th at p. 124.)

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On September 20, 2010, defendant pled no contest to first degree burglary (Pen. Code, § 459) in Shasta County

case No. 10F3962. That conviction, along with defendant's convictions in several other cases, was affirmed by this court on April 12, 2011. (*People v. Martinez* (Apr. 12, 2011, C066838) [nonpub. opn].) Defendant was subsequently ordered to pay direct restitution to her victim totaling \$13,246.18. Defendant appealed from that restitution order. Defendant applied for a certificate of probable cause, which the trial court denied on the basis that a certificate of probable cause was unnecessary.

Defendant filed a second notice of appeal on February 8, 2011, appealing the trial court's "denial of Marsden hearing" and "denial to withdraw plea." She was denied a certificate of probable cause on that notice of appeal as well.

II. DISCUSSION

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asked this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. We received a supplemental brief from defendant. Defendant fails, however, to raise any claim of error in her supplemental brief.

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

_____ MURRAY _____, J.

We concur:

_____ NICHOLSON _____, Acting P. J.

_____ ROBIE _____, J.