

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

(Yolo)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LEALON CARL BEECHER,

Defendant and Appellant.

C074512

(Super. Ct. No. CRF124712)

Appointed counsel for defendant Lealon Carl Beecher 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

Defendant possessed .03 grams of methamphetamine on December 1, 2012. After the trial court denied his motion to suppress evidence (made pursuant to Penal Code section 1538.5), defendant pleaded no contest to possession of a controlled substance

(methamphetamine) (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd (a)) and admitted a prior strike conviction (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subd. (c), 667, subds. (e)-(i)).

The trial court dismissed the remaining charges, sentenced defendant to the stipulated aggregate term of 32 months in state prison, and awarded him 445 days of presentence custody credit. The trial court also ordered defendant to pay a \$300 restitution fund fine (Pen. Code, § 1202.4); a \$300 parole revocation fine suspended unless parole is revoked (Pen. Code, § 1202.45); a \$50 criminal laboratory analysis fee, plus penalty assessment of \$155; a \$40 court operations fee (Pen. Code, § 1465.8, subd. (a)(1)); and a \$30 court facilities assessment (Gov. Code, § 70373).

Defendant did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

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.

MAURO, J.

We concur:

RAYE, P. J.

MURRAY, J.