

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

DANIEL LAMONTE WATSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

C079830

(Super. Ct. No. CRF15217)

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**

On April 17, 2015, defendant Daniel Lamonte Watson slapped his former spouse in the face. Thereafter, during a struggle between them, she suffered a one-inch laceration to her finger.

Defendant entered a no contest plea to infliction of corporal injury upon a former spouse with a previous conviction for the same or similar offense, a felony (Pen. Code, § 273.5, subd. (f)(1)) in exchange for dismissal of a prior strike conviction (first degree burglary), no state prison at the outset, and residential drug treatment as a condition of probation.

After denying defendant's motion to withdraw his plea, the court suspended imposition of sentence and granted probation subject to certain terms and conditions including residential treatment, a 52-week batterers' treatment program, and various fees and fines.

The trial court granted his request for a certificate of probable cause. (Pen. Code, § 1237.5.)

#### **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.) 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.

MURRAY, Acting P. J.

We concur:

DUARTE, J.

RENNER, J.