

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

(Tehama)

-----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ELAINE SUE GALLAGHAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

C069852

(Super. Ct. No.  
NCR68453)

On March 26, 2006, a California Highway Patrol Officer conducted a traffic stop on defendant Elaine Sue Gallagher for speeding. Defendant was arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol. During a search of defendant's car, an officer found a baggie of methamphetamine in a coin purse in defendant's bag.

Defendant pled no contest to possession of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a)). The trial court sentenced defendant to two years in state prison, suspended imposition of sentence, and placed her on five years'

Proposition 36 probation subject to various conditions, including the payment of certain fines and fees.

Defendant stopped reporting to her probation officer in August 2008. She moved without permission, failed to notify her probation officer of the move, and failed to make payments on her fines and fees.

Defendant admitted violating her probation. On October 25, 2011, the trial court executed the previously imposed sentence and committed defendant to a two-year term in county jail (Pen. Code, § 1170, subd. (h)(1), (2)), imposed various fines and fees, and awarded 128 days of presentence credit (86 actual and 42 conduct). The trial court subsequently amended the conduct credits to 86 days, for a total of 172 days of presentence credit.

Defendant appeals. She did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 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. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NICHOLSON, Acting P. J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
BUTZ, J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAURO, J.