

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

ANDRES RAY RENDON,

Defendant and Appellant.

E058930

(Super.Ct.No. RIF087242)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Becky Dugan, Judge.

Affirmed.

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

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

On February 23, 2001, following what appears to have been a guilty plea, the trial court sentenced defendant and appellant Andres Ray Rendon to a total determinate term

of 30 years. The court also awarded defendant credit for time served of 416 days: 362 actual days plus 54 days under former Penal Code¹ section 2933.1. The court imposed a restitution fine under former section 1202.4, subdivision (b), in the amount of \$10,000, and a parole revocation fine in the same amount, suspended unless parole is revoked under former section 1202.45.

On May 8, 2013, defendant filed an in pro. per. “petition for a sentence reduction.” On May 20, the trial court found that defendant’s conviction under section 187 made him “not eligible for relief” pursuant to section 1170.126, and denied the petition.

On June 10, 2013, defendant filed a timely notice of appeal.

ANALYSIS²

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, 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.

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

² Because this is an appeal from the denial of defendant’s petition for a sentence reduction, there is nothing in the record pertaining to the underlying offense.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RICHLI
J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST
Acting P. J.

McKINSTER
J.