

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

(Colusa)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CAROL SUE CADDY,

Defendant and Appellant.

C071604

(Super. Ct. No. CR53431)

This case comes to us pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Having reviewed the record as required by *Wende*, we affirm the judgment.

We provide the following brief description of the facts and procedural history of the case. (See *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110, 124.)

On September 19, 2011, defendant Carol Sue Caddy entered a drugstore and claimed she needed to pick up a prescription, giving a false name and date of birth. While an employee searched for the prescription, defendant went behind the counter and put her hand in her purse. She held something that poked the end of the purse, suggesting

a gun. Defendant threatened to shoot the employee and demanded certain drugs. The employee gave the drugs to defendant, who thereafter left the store.

Defendant entered a plea of guilty to second degree robbery (Pen. Code, § 211) and was released to a rehabilitation program pending sentencing. Defendant waived credit for time spent in the rehabilitation program. The court sentenced defendant to state prison for the midterm of three years.

Defendant appeals. She did not obtain a certificate of probable cause. (Pen. Code, § 1237.5.)

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, 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 have elapsed, and we have 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.

MURRAY, J.

We concur:

BLEASE, Acting P. J.

DUARTE, J.