

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

RANIKA D. LINDSEY,

Defendant and Appellant.

C071494

(Super. Ct. No. 08F01223)

Appointed counsel for defendant Ranika D. Lindsey 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 affirm the judgment.

I

On January 22, 2008, defendant assaulted Anna M., using a piece of glass to cut Anna's forehead and hand. Both of Anna's injuries required stitches. Defendant was charged with assault with force likely to produce great bodily injury (Pen. Code, § 245,

subd. (a)(1)); she pleaded no contest to the charge. In exchange for her plea, defendant was granted five years of formal probation and ordered to serve 120 days in county jail. Defendant was awarded 93 days of custody credit.¹

On August 24, 2010, a petition was filed alleging defendant violated her probation. Specifically, the petition alleged defendant committed a petty theft with a prior conviction for petty theft in violation of Penal Code section 666. Defendant admitted the violation and her probation was reinstated with the condition that she serve an additional 90 days in county jail with credit for three days. Defendant also was ordered to stay away from “the Save Mart store located at or about 2735 Marconi Avenue in Sacramento.”

A second petition alleging defendant violated her probation was filed on December 28, 2010. That petition alleged defendant committed another petty theft with a prior conviction for petty theft in violation of Penal Code section 666. Defendant admitted the violation and her probation was reinstated with the condition that she serve another 30 days in county jail, which could be served on work release. Defendant also was ordered to stay away from “The Gap located at 545 K [S]treet and the K Street Mall.”

A third petition alleging defendant violated her probation was filed on April 12, 2012. That petition alleged defendant committed another petty theft with a prior conviction for petty theft in violation of Penal Code section 666. Defendant admitted the violation and her probation was reinstated with the condition that she serve another 120

¹ In an unrelated matter, “case [number] ending 5237,” defendant was deleted from the “Narcotic Diversion Program,” and placed on three years of informal probation. She was also ordered to serve 90 days in county jail, with five days’ credit for “time served,” “consecutive to the times [*sic*] she’s now doing.”

days in county jail with credit for nine days. Defendant also was ordered to stay away from “Ultra,” a business located at 2100 Arden Way.

Defendant appeals; her request for a certificate of probable cause was granted.

II

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and asking 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 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, J.

We concur:

RAYE, P. J.

BLEASE, J.