

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

Defendant and Appellant.

C075853

(Super. Ct. No. 13F05417)

This case comes to us pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). 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.)

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Over a two-month period in the summer of 2013, defendant Christopher Alexander McCowan-Nance sent hundreds of e-mails to the victim, threatening to ruin the victim's life, financial well-being and his career. The victim considered defendant's

e-mails as threats to his safety, causing him to be physically in fear. In April 2013, defendant was convicted of stalking the victim.

Defendant entered a negotiated plea of no contest to stalking and admitted a prior stalking conviction (Pen. Code, § 646.9, subd. (c)(2)) in exchange for a sentencing bid of two years in state prison.¹

The court denied probation and sentenced defendant to state prison for the low term of two years, awarded 270 days of presentence custody credit, and imposed various fees and fines.

Defendant appeals. His request for a certificate of probable cause (Pen. Code, § 1237.5) was denied.

WENDE REVIEW

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. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) (AOB 4) 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.

¹ Defendant also admitted violating probation in case No. 13F01378 [April stalking case] for concurrent time. Defendant did not appeal in case No. 13F01378.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

MURRAY, J.

We concur:

BLEASE, Acting P. J.

HULL, J.