

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHRISTOPHER ANDREW GRAHAMSHULTS,

Defendant and Appellant.

C077762

(Super. Ct. No. 14-CR-21871)

Appointed counsel for defendant Christopher Andrew Grahamshults has filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal.¹ (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we affirm the judgment.

¹ 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.

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 February 22, 2014, officers responded to a report from Clarice Boitano that her apartment had been burglarized. Boitano reported that she and her boyfriend had gone to bed around 10:00 p.m. the night before and woke up to find that someone had entered the apartment during the night and stolen a television, a gaming system and games, a laptop computer, some keys, and Boitano's purse. A second victim from the same apartment complex also reported that his apartment had been burglarized and a laptop computer was missing.

Surveillance footage taken in the area showed defendant, who also lived in the apartment complex, walking between parked cars and trying to open doors, and then walking up the stairs leading to Boitano's apartment. An officer went to defendant's apartment and advised defendant he had been seen on video surveillance burglarizing apartments. Defendant then admitted he had been intoxicated, burglarized two apartments, put the stolen items in duffel bags, and had taken them to his aunt's house. The officer transported defendant to his aunt's house where most of the items were recovered.

Defendant pled guilty to one count of first degree burglary with a person present. (Pen. Code, § 459.) In exchange for his plea, it was agreed he would receive a two-year sentence and the remaining counts would be dismissed. On August 28, 2014, in accordance with the plea agreement, the trial court sentenced defendant to two years, imposed a \$600 restitution fine, and awarded him three days of presentence custody credit.

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

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.

BLEASE _____, Acting P. J.

We concur:

ROBIE _____, J.

MURRAY _____, J.