

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DONALD EARL GARRETT,

Defendant and Appellant.

D062110

(Super. Ct. Nos. SCD234643 &
SCD236730)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, David M.

Szumowski, Judge. Affirmed.

In June 2011, in case No. SCD234643, Donald Earl Garrett entered a negotiated guilty plea to possessing cocaine base (Health & Saf. Code, § 11350, subd. (a)) and admitted having served two prior prison terms (Pen. Code, § 667.5, subd. (b)). The court placed him on three years' probation and later formally revoked probation. In April 2012, in case No. SCD236730, Garrett entered a negotiated guilty plea to robbery (Pen. Code, § 211). In May, the court reinstated probation in case No. SCD234643 and placed Garrett on three years' probation in case No. SCD236730. Garrett appeals. We affirm.

BACKGROUND

In case No. SCD234643, Garrett unlawfully possessed a useable quantity of cocaine base. In case No. SCD236730, he unlawfully and by means of force and fear took personal property from the person of another.

DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. Counsel presents no argument for reversal, but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*) counsel lists as possible, but not arguable, issues: (1) whether Garrett was properly advised of his constitutional rights and the consequences of pleading guilty; and (2) whether he voluntarily waived those rights.

We granted Garrett permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded. A review of the record pursuant to *Wende* and *Anders*, including the possible issues listed pursuant to *Anders*, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issues. Garrett has been competently represented by counsel on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

McCONNELL, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

BENKE, J.

NARES, J.