

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

PABLO ALFONSO FOURQUET,

Defendant and Appellant.

E055305

(Super.Ct.No. RIF1100970)

OPINION

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

James R. Bostwick, Jr., under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant appeals after pleading guilty to a single theft charge resulting from a
scheme to defraud thousands of homeowners. He was sentenced to time served and
placed on probation for three years. We affirm the conviction.

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

Beginning in 2009, defendant sent official-looking letters to thousands of homeowners in Riverside County under the letterhead of his business, Title Compliance Office. The letters told the homeowners that they needed to obtain a certified copy of the grant deed to their property, and that they could obtain one if they sent \$167 to Title Compliance Office by the stated deadline. In 2010 and 2011, defendant submitted to the Riverside County Assessor Clerk Recorder's office a total of 2496 requests for certified copies of grant deeds.

On April 22, 2011, the People charged defendant with grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (a)) and conspiring with another person to commit fraud (§182, subd. (a)(4)).¹ Defendant filed a written motion to suppress evidence and return property seized under a search warrant. After written opposition and argument, the court denied the motion.

On September 1, 2011, defendant filed a section 995 motion arguing the evidence produced at the preliminary hearing was not sufficient to hold him. The court denied the motion. Defendant did not renew his previous motion to suppress evidence.

On October 11, 2011, defendant pled guilty to grand theft. As set forth in the plea agreement, the trial court sentenced defendant to time served and placed him on three years of formal probation. In addition, defendant relinquished \$417,000 in seized accounts to pay victim restitution. This appeal followed.

¹ All section references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise indicated.

DISCUSSION

Upon defendant's request, this court appointed counsel to represent him on appeal. 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 [87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493], setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts, and potential arguable issues and requesting this court to conduct an independent review of the record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but he has not done so. Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have independently reviewed the record for potential error and find no arguable issues.

DISPOSITION

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ
P. J.

We concur:

KING
J.

MILLER
J.