

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

DANIEL JIMENEZ LOPEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

D067542

(Super. Ct. No. SCS276402)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Garry G. Haehnle, Judge. Affirmed.

Anna M. Jauregui, under appointment by the Court of Appeal for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Daniel Jimenez Lopez pleaded guilty to importing over one kilogram of methamphetamine into California (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 11379, subd. (a), 11370.4,

subd. (b)(1)). As the factual basis for his plea, he acknowledged he "unlawfully imported into this state or offered to import into this state a controlled substance, that being methamphetamine, and its weight exceeded one kilogram." The trial court imposed a stipulated sentence of six years in jail. The court later denied his request for a certificate of probable cause.

## DISCUSSION

Lopez appeals. His notice of appeal limits the issues on appeal to sentencing or other matters occurring after the plea that do not affect the plea's validity (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.304(b)(4)).

Appointed appellate counsel filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. Counsel presented no argument for reversal and instead requested we independently review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442. To aid our review, counsel identified one possible issue (see *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, 744): whether the court correctly sentenced Lopez in accordance with the plea bargain.

We granted Lopez permission to file a supplemental brief on his own behalf. He submitted a supplemental brief to appellate counsel, who submitted it to us after translating it and excising attorney-client privileged matters. The brief does not assert any trial court errors. Rather, it states Lopez is a family man with five children whom he misses, he has never been drunk and is not a drug addict, he has a consistent work history, he has never had problems with authorities in either Mexico or the United States, he has never previously been incarcerated, and he would like to serve less time.

After independently reviewing the record for error and considering the points in appellate counsel's and Lopez's briefs, we were unable to identify any reasonably arguable appellate issue and, therefore, affirm the judgment. Lazarus was competently represented in this appeal.

#### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

McCONNELL, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

BENKE, J.

McDONALD, J.