

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

GUY O. WILLIAMSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

D069155

(Super. Ct. No. SCD261969)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Polly H. Shamoan and Kathleen M. Lewis, Judges. Affirmed.

Jan B. Norman, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

As part of a plea agreement, Guy O. Williamson entered a guilty plea to one count of throwing a glass bottle at a vehicle capable of doing serious bodily injury (Veh. Code, § 23110, subd. (b)). The remaining count and the seven alleged prison priors were

dismissed. The parties agreed to a sentence of three years in prison. Consistent with the plea agreement the court sentenced Appellant to a three-year term.

After sentencing, Appellant filed a motion to reduce his conviction to a misdemeanor. The motion was summarily denied.

Appellant has filed a timely notice of appeal.

Appellate counsel has filed a brief in accordance with *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), indicating counsel has been unable to identify any reasonably arguable issue for reversal on appeal. Counsel asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *Wende*. We invited Appellant to file his own brief on appeal, but he has not responded.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

In his change of plea, Appellant admitted that he threw a glass bottle that hit a car and that it was capable of inflicting great bodily injury.

DISCUSSION

As we have noted, appellate counsel has not identified any reasonably arguable issues for reversal on appeal. Counsel has asked this court to review the record for error as mandated by *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436. In compliance with *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*) and in order to assist the court in its review, appellate counsel has identified the following possible, but not arguable issue:

Whether the trial court abused its discretion in denying the motion to reduce the conviction to a misdemeanor.

We have reviewed the entire record as mandated by *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders, supra*, 386 U.S. 738. We have not been able to identify any reasonably arguable issue for reversal on appeal. Competent counsel has represented Appellant on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

NARES, J.

AARON, J.