

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

DANNY LEE BECHTEL,

Defendant and Appellant.

D064725

(Super. Ct. No. SCD249712)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Laura W. Halgren, Judge. Affirmed.

Marilee Marshall, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

A felony complaint alleged that on or about July 24, 2013, defendant and appellant Danny Lee Bechtel was in possession of methamphetamine in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11377, subdivision (a). On August 6, 2013, pursuant to a negotiated plea agreement, Bechtel pled guilty and admitted he unlawfully possessed a usable

amount of methamphetamine. Imposition of sentence was suspended for three years, and Bechtel was placed on formal probation; Bechtel was also ordered to serve 28 days in custody, with credit for time served. In addition, Bechtel was required to complete 80 hours of volunteer work and register as a narcotics offender. Bechtel filed a timely notice of appeal. We affirm.

#### 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. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel lists as a possible, but not arguable, issue: whether Bechtel's rights at sentencing were violated.

We gave Bechtel permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded. A review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738 has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issue. Bechtel has been competently represented by counsel on this appeal.

#### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

BENKE, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

O'ROURKE, J.

IRION, J.