

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

**DIVISION TWO**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHERYL ELAINE YOUNG,

Defendant and Appellant.

E053951

(Super.Ct.No. BAF006650)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Edward D. Webster, Judge. (Retired judge of the Riverside Super. Ct. assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to art. VI, § 6 of the Cal. Const.) Affirmed.

Mark S. Devore, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General, and Gary W. Schons, Assistant Attorney General, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

This is the second appeal in this case, which involves simple possession of methamphetamine. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a).) The defendant, Cheryl Elaine Young, pled guilty and admitted a prison prior after the trial court denied both her motion to suppress evidence pursuant to Penal Code section 1538.5 and her *Pitchess*<sup>1</sup> motion to discover peace officer personnel records. Defendant appealed the trial court's denial of these two motions. We affirmed the ruling on the motion to suppress, but remanded the matter to the trial court for an in camera review of the requested personnel records.

On remand, the trial court conducted an in camera hearing on June 29, 2011. According to the court's minute order, it found no disclosable information. The trial court thereafter reinstated the conviction. Defendant appeals, asking this court to review the record of the in camera hearing to determine if the trial court erred in refusing to disclose complaints made against the named police officers. The People agree that defendant is entitled to such a review. (*People v. Mooc* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1216, 1228.)

After reviewing the sealed transcripts of in camera proceedings, we conclude, as did the trial court, that the records contain no discoverable material pertinent to the defendant's request. There was no error.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pitchess v. Superior Court* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 531.

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ  
P. J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST  
J.

McKINSTER  
J.