

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

GEOFFREY FENTON BRADLEY,

Defendant and Appellant.

E064607

(Super.Ct.No. FSB1501447)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Richard V. Peel,  
Judge. Affirmed.

Susan L. Ferguson, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and  
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant and appellant Geoffrey Fenton Bradley was charged by amended felony complaint with failure to register as a sex offender. (Pen. Code,<sup>1</sup> § 290, subd. (b), count 1.) It was also alleged that he had one prior strike conviction (§§ 1170.12, subds. (a)-(d) & 667, subds. (b)-(i)), and that he had served four prior prison terms (§§ 667.5, subd. (b).) Pursuant to a plea agreement, defendant pled guilty to count 1. In accordance with the plea agreement, the court sentenced him to the upper term of three years in state prison and awarded 392 days of presentence custody credits. The court also struck the remaining allegations. Defendant subsequently requested a correction of presentence custody credits to 452 days, which the court granted.

Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal, based on the sentence or other matters that occurred after the plea. We affirm.

### PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Defendant was charged with and admitted that, on or about April 21, 2015, he failed to register as a sex offender, as required pursuant to section 290, subdivision (c). (§ 290, subd. (b).)

### DISCUSSION

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 and one potential arguable issue: whether the court awarded the correct amount

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references will be to the Penal Code, unless otherwise noted.

of presentence custody credits. Counsel has also requested this court to undertake a review of the entire record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, which he has not done.

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

HOLLENHORST  
J.

We concur:

RAMIREZ  
P. J.

McKINSTER  
J.