

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

MARKUS LEE PACE,

Defendant and Appellant.

C070604

(Super. Ct. No.
CRF1263)

Appointed counsel for defendant Markus Lee Pace asked this court to review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*)). Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we will affirm the judgment.

I

On January 30, 2012, Marysville police officers observed a reported stolen car parked at defendant's house. The California

Highway Patrol subsequently determined that the car ignition was stripped and that defendant put his license plate on the car.

Defendant was charged with one count of receiving stolen property (Pen. Code, § 496d, subd. (a)).¹ He pleaded no contest on the understanding that he would be sentenced to the low term of 16 months in state prison, to be served in the county jail. (§ 1170, subd. (h)(5)(A).)

The trial court imposed the agreed-upon 16-month sentence and awarded defendant 33 days of presentence custody credit (17 actual days and 16 conduct days). The trial court also imposed a \$240 restitution fine (§ 1202.4, subd. (b)), a \$40 court security fee (§ 1465.8), and a \$30 criminal conviction assessment fee (Gov. Code, § 70373).

II

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief that set 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. 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.

¹ Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

_____ MAURO _____, J.

We concur:

_____ NICHOLSON _____, Acting P. J.

_____ BUTZ _____, J.