

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL BOCK,

Defendant and Appellant.

C070786

(Super. Ct. No. 11F07083)

Appointed counsel for defendant Christopher Michael Bock has asked this court to review the record to determine whether there exist any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*)). We find no errors and no concerns regarding presentence credits. We shall affirm the judgment.

BACKGROUND

In October 2011, defendant and an unidentified individual set up a meeting with Alicia Newey, who was working as a prostitute. Defendant and his cohort walked into Newey's motel room, threw her against the wall, choked her, and took her car keys, some marijuana, and a cell phone.

Defendant was charged with robbery (Pen. Code,¹ § 211), assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury (§ 245, subd. (a)(1)), possession of hydrocodone (Health & Saf. Code, § 11350, subd. (a)), and misdemeanor driving with a suspended license (Veh. Code, § 14601.1, subd. (a)). The parties reached a plea agreement under which defendant pled no contest to robbery for a stipulated low term sentence of three years in state prison. The remaining charges were dismissed.

The trial court sentenced defendant to three years in prison, in accordance with the plea agreement. It awarded defendant 144 days of presentence custody credit and ordered him to pay a \$200 restitution fund fine, a \$30 criminal conviction assessment, and a \$40 court security fee. It waived the jail booking and classification fees. Defendant did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

DISCUSSION

Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks us to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Counsel advised defendant of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days have elapsed, and we have received no communication from defendant. We have undertaken an examination of the entire record and 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.

DUARTE, J.

We concur:

RAYE, P. J.

NICHOLSON, J.