

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

CHRISTOPHER GEORGE
KALOGIROU,

Defendant and Appellant.

E064531

(Super.Ct.No. SWF1501347)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Judith C. Clark, Judge.

Affirmed.

William Paul Melcher, under the appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant and appellant Christopher George Kalogirou appeals from his
conviction and five-year sentence after he pleaded guilty to conspiring to sell or give a
controlled substance to a prison inmate. We affirm the judgment.

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

On September 3, 2015, the People filed a first amended complaint alleging that on or about February 20, 2015, defendant conspired with an unknown person to commit the crime of selling or giving a controlled substance to a prison inmate. (Pen. Code, § 4573.9.) The overt acts alleged are that the conspirators: (1) contacted each other by phone; (2) discussed “skaduche” being in a letter addressed from “Sharon Wood”; and (3) a letter addressed from “Sharon Wood” was sent to the Southwest Detention Center containing methamphetamine. The People also alleged defendant had three prior prison term convictions within the meaning of Penal Code section 667.5, subdivision (b).

Also on September 3, 2015, defendant pled guilty to the conspiracy charge and admitted the three prison term priors. The court immediately sentenced him to the middle term of four years, plus one year for one of the prison term priors, with four years in custody and one year of mandatory supervision.

This appeal followed.

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, 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, and he has not done so. Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we

have independently reviewed the entire record for potential error and find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ
P. J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST
J.

McKINSTER
J.