

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

(Butte)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MATHEW ROYCE FINLEY,

Defendant and Appellant.

C074226

(Super. Ct. No. CM037377)

On September 20, 2012, at about 10:23 p.m., deputies conducted a traffic stop on a Chevrolet truck driven by defendant Mathew Royce Finley. The truck was searched and a deputy found a handgun, a black metal ammunition can with three boxes of rifle ammunition, a small amount of marijuana, a butterfly knife, and three T-shirts with the Vagos Motorcycle Club insignia on them. Defendant was on parole at the time.

Defendant pleaded no contest to possession of ammunition by a felon (Pen. Code, § 30305, subd. (a)(1)) and admitted a strike and a prior prison term (Pen. Code, §§ 1170.12, subds. (a)-(d), 667.5, subd. (b)). The trial court denied defendant's motion to

dismiss the strike and sentenced him to seven years in state prison, imposed various fines and fees, and awarded 560 days of presentence credits (280 actual and 280 conduct).

Defendant appeals. He did not 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.

RAYE, P. J.

We concur:

HULL, J.

MAURO, J.