

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JORDAN CANNON MOORE,

Defendant and Appellant.

E054783

(Super.Ct.No. RIF1105286)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Richard Todd Fields,
Judge. Affirmed.

Patrick E. DuNah, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

On October 5, 2011, a felony complaint charged defendant and appellant Jordan Cannon Moore (defendant) with two counts of robbery under Penal Code¹ section 211 (counts 1 & 3), and two counts of burglary under section 459 (counts 2 & 4).

Pursuant to a plea agreement, defendant pled guilty to all the charges, in exchange for a two-year state prison term. The trial court sentenced defendant to the agreed-upon term of two years and denied probation, as follows: (1) low term of two years on count 1, the principal term; (2) low term of 16 months on count 2, stayed under section 654; (3) low term of two years on count 3, to run concurrent; and (4) low term of 16 months on count 4, stayed under section 654.

The trial court awarded 19 days of custody credits under section 2933.1. The court also imposed a \$200 restitution fine under section 1202.4, and a \$200 parole revocation fine under section 1202.45, stayed pending successful completion of parole.

On November 22, 2011, defendant filed a timely notice of appeal challenging the sentence or other matters occurring after the plea.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

There are no facts in the record concerning the charges in this case. As a factual basis for his plea, defendant admitted that he did in fact “do what the [c]omplaint says[.]”

¹ All statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise specified.

ANALYSIS

After defendant appealed, and upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts, and potential arguable issues, and requesting this court to undertake a review of the entire record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief in both cases, but he has not done so. Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have conducted an independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

MCKINSTER
Acting P.J.

We concur:

RICHLI
J.

MILLER
J.