

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

SIA THAO,

Defendant and Appellant.

----

C080633

(Super. Ct. No. 15F05162)

Appointed counsel for defendant Sia Thao asked this court to review the record and 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 pleaded no contest to being a felon in possession of a firearm (Pen. Code, § 29800, subd. (a)(1) -- count one)<sup>1</sup> in exchange for dismissal of other counts and a stipulated low-term sentence of 16 months in state prison. The factual basis was that on August 21, 2005, defendant, a convicted felon, possessed a .40-caliber semiautomatic handgun.

---

<sup>1</sup> Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

Consistent with the plea agreement, the trial court denied probation and sentenced defendant to 16 months in state prison. In addition, the trial court awarded 24 days of presentence credit (12 actual days and 12 conduct days), imposed only minimum mandatory fines, and terminated defendant's probation in case No. 15F01485. The abstract of judgment lists a \$300 restitution fine (§ 1202.4), a \$300 parole revocation fine (§ 1202.45), a \$40 court operations assessment (§ 1465.8, subd. (a)(1)), and a \$30 criminal conviction assessment (Gov. Code, § 70373).

Defendant did not request 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/S/  
MAURO, J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
/S/  
BUTZ, Acting P. J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/S/  
DUARTE, J.