

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JAY KRATT,

Defendant and Appellant.

D063019

(Super. Ct. No. SCN295593)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County,  
Daniel B. Goldstein, Judge. Affirmed.

Sarah Kleven McGann, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for  
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

A deputy sheriff concluded that Jay Kratt had been driving under the  
influence and arrested him. Kratt was charged with one count each of possession  
of a controlled substance and driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs

within ten years of a prior offense of driving under the influence. The information also alleged that Kratt had two strike prior convictions.

The trial court found Kratt guilty of both charges. Kratt later admitted his two strike prior convictions. The trial court struck Kratt's prior strikes and imposed a middle term of two years. The court also imposed several fees and penalties, including a drug program fee and criminal justice administration fee. Kratt timely appealed.

## DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. She 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 possible but not arguable issues, whether the trial court erred in not determining Kratt's ability to pay the drug program fee and the criminal justice administration fee.

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

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

McINTYRE, J.

WE CONCUR:

HALLER, Acting P. J.

O'ROURKE, J.