

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THEDFORD SYPHO,

Defendant and Appellant.

D067984

(Super. Ct. Nos. SCD255848,  
SCD257666)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County,

David M. Szumowski, Judge. Affirmed.

Steven J. Carroll, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant  
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In case number SCD255848 (case one), Thedford Sypho pleaded guilty to carrying a dirk or dagger and possessing methamphetamine. The trial court suspended imposition of sentence and placed Sypho on probation for a period of three years. In case number SCD257666 (case two), Sypho pleaded guilty to

resisting an executive officer. The plea provided Sypho credit for time served, concurrent with the sentence imposed for a revocation of probation in case one.

Sypho later appeared before the court for probation violations in both cases. Sypho admitted that he failed to remain law-abiding and the trial court revoked probation. The probation department recommended a two-year sentence in local custody. In case two, the trial court reinstated probation on the condition that Sypho serve 300 days in custody. He received credit for 111 days of actual custody and 110 days of Penal Code section 4019 custody. In case one, the court reinstated probation on the condition that Sypho serve 365 days in custody. He received credit for 204 days of actual custody. Sypho waived Penal Code section 4019 credits as an alternative to the sentence recommended by probation. The trial court stayed all fines, fees or costs in both cases. Sypho timely appealed both cases.

## DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has 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*). We granted Sypho permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded.

Our review of the record pursuant to *Wende*, has disclosed no reasonably arguable issues on appeal. Competent counsel has represented Sypho on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

McINTYRE, J.

WE CONCUR:

NARES, Acting P. J.

McDONALD, J.