

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

GEORGE DAVID ROSADO,

Defendant and Appellant.

D062684

(Super. Ct. No. SCE294040)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County,
John M. Thompson, Judge. Affirmed.

A jury previously convicted Rosado of two counts of committing a forcible lewd act (counts 1 and 2) and seven counts of committing a lewd act (counts 3 to 9). As to each count, the jury found it true that Rosado had committed qualifying sexual offenses against multiple victims. (*People v. Rosado* (Jan. 23, 2012, D058356) [nonpub. opn.].) On appeal from the judgment, we reversed Rosado's

convictions on counts 1 and 8 due to instructional error and affirmed the remainder of the judgment. (*Ibid.*) On remand, the district attorney elected to dismiss counts 1 and 8.

At a resentencing hearing, the trial court sentenced Rosado to a total prison term of 16 years plus 45 years to life consisting of consecutive sentences of eight years for each of counts 2 and 5, plus consecutive one strike sentences of 15 years to life for each of counts 3, 7, and 9. The trial court imposed a concurrent sentence of 15 years to life for counts 4 and 6.

DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. He presented no argument for reversal, but asked this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). Under *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*), counsel listed as a possible but not arguable issue, whether our reversal of count 8 precluded imposition of sentence on count 9. We granted Rosado permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded. Our review of the record pursuant to *Wende*, including the possible issue listed by counsel pursuant to *Anders*, has disclosed no reasonably arguable issues on appeal. Competent counsel has represented Rosado on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

MCINTYRE, J.

WE CONCUR:

McCONNELL, P. J.

NARES, J.