

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

(Yuba)

-----

THE PEOPLE,  
  
Plaintiff and Respondent,  
  
v.  
  
SCOTT ROBIN SUTTON,  
  
Defendant and Appellant.

C070330

(Super. Ct. No.  
CRF11-653)

Marysville police officers attempted a traffic stop of defendant Scott Robin Sutton because of how he was driving. Defendant fled from the officers, ran stop signs and drove at speeds of over 100 miles per hour. Defendant eventually drove his car off the road and was taken into custody. Defendant pleaded guilty to evading a police officer with willful and wanton disregard for the safety of people or property and additional charges against him were dismissed. (Veh. Code, § 2800.2, subd. (a).) The court sentenced defendant in accordance

with the plea, to two years in state prison with credit for 116 days. The court imposed a restitution fund fine of \$200, a suspended parole revocation fine of \$200, a \$40 court security fee, a \$30 criminal conviction assessment, and a \$4 penalty under Government Code section 76000.10, subdivision (c)(1). Defendant did not seek or 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.