

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

SEAN MICHAEL GOLDRICH,

Defendant and Appellant.

E065216

(Super.Ct.No. BAF1500993)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Jorge C. Hernandez,
Judge. Affirmed.

Dawn S. Mortazavi, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant Sean Michael Goldrich is serving a prison term of 32 months after
pleading guilty to grand theft and admitting a prior strike conviction. We affirm the
judgment.

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

On October 20, 2015, defendant stole a purse, wallet and cash from the victim.

On October 23, 2015, the People filed a felony complaint charging defendant with grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (a))¹ and alleging defendant had a prison term prior (§ 667.5, subd. (b)) and a prior strike conviction (§§ 667, subds. (c) & (e)(1), 1170.12, subd. (c)(1)) for first degree burglary (§ 459).

On November 3, 2015, defendant pled guilty to the grand theft and admitted the prior strike conviction.

On November 23, 2015, the court sentenced defendant as agreed to the low term of 16 months for the grand theft, doubled to 32 months for the prior strike conviction. Victim restitution was set at \$800 as set forth in the plea agreement.

This appeal followed on January 15, 2016. The trial court granted a certificate of probable cause.

DISCUSSION

After defendant appealed, upon his 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.

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

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.