

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

STEVEN E. LAVOIE,

Defendant and Appellant.

D066665

(Super. Ct. No. SCN330439)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Carlos O. Armour and Richard Monroy, Judges. Affirmed.

Richard Power, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Steven Lavoie was charged with possession of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a)) and unlawfully driving a motor vehicle without a license (Veh. Code, § 12500, subd. (a)), with the allegation he had numerous "probation denial" prior convictions. After his Penal Code section 1538.5 motion to suppress was denied, he

entered into a plea bargain pursuant to which Lavoie pleaded guilty to possession of methamphetamine with the further agreement the other charges and allegations would be dismissed. The court granted Lavoie formal probations, with imposition of sentence suspended for three years, and the court imposed various terms, conditions and fines.

Lavoie filed a notice of appeal. We affirm the judgment.

FACTS

Lavoie admitted that, on March 29, 2014, he unlawfully possessed methamphetamine in a usable amount.

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 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738. Counsel identifies as a possible issue whether the motion to suppress should have been granted, but presents no argument for reversal as to this claim.

We granted Lavoie permission to file a supplemental brief on his own behalf, but 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 issues. Lavoie has been competently represented by counsel on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

McDONALD, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

McINTYRE, J.

O'ROURKE, J.