

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

(El Dorado)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SHANNON MICHELLE SOUZA,

Defendant and Appellant.

C069871

(Super. Ct. No.
P10CRF0336)

Convicted of receiving stolen property (Pen. Code, § 496, subd. (a)), defendant Shannon Michelle Souza appeals from victim restitution orders made after a hearing held 10 months after she was granted probation. At the hearing, claims by two victims were submitted. Defense counsel did not dispute one victim's claim in the amount of \$800 for a stolen purse and its contents, a camera, keys, and a damaged truck, but did dispute the other

victim's claim in the amount of \$19,748.20 for stolen diabetes medication worth \$1,719.70, which she was not able to replace, and a hospital stay costing \$18,028.50. The victim claimed that two days after her medication was stolen, she went to the emergency room, stayed in the hospital for four days, and did not have any insurance to cover the cost. No evidence other than the claims was submitted. Defense counsel argued that defendant's crime was not the proximate cause of the victim's medical expenses. The court concluded that the victim "submitted a verified claim under penalty of perjury as to the amount of her injuries. It would appear that she's alleging that it was a direct result of the loss of her medications." The court ordered defendant to pay one victim \$800 and the other victim \$19,748.20 with a 10 percent administrative fee, jointly and severally with her two codefendants.

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 orders of restitution are affirmed.

_____ RAYE _____, P. J.

We concur:

_____ HULL _____, J.

_____ ROBIE _____, J.