

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

(Yuba)

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ESPIRIO GRANADOS,

Defendant and Appellant.

C077265

(Super. Ct. No. CRF14-324)

Appointed counsel for defendant Espirio Granados has asked this court to review the record to determine whether there exist any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we will affirm the judgment.

BACKGROUND

In 2011, defendant was convicted of violating Penal Code section 289, subdivision (i). As a result, defendant is required to register as a sex offender. In April 2014, law enforcement attempted to contact defendant for a compliance check. When they arrived

at the address where he was registered, they learned defendant did not live there and had not lived there for over a month.

Defendant was arrested and charged with failure to register his change of address. (Pen. Code, § 290.013.) Defendant pleaded guilty to the charge. Defendant also admitted this conduct violated his postrelease community supervision in case No. CRMS-14-0018.

The trial court subsequently denied defendant's request for probation and sentenced him to an aggregate term of two years in state prison, along with a concurrent term of 180 days in case No. CRMS-14-0018. The court ordered defendant to pay various fines and fees and awarded him 137 days of custody credit. Defendant appeals without a certificate of probable cause.

#### DISCUSSION

Counsel filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and requests that we 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NICHOLSON, Acting P. J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ROBIE, J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MURRAY, J.