

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CAROLINE BARBOZA,

Defendant and Appellant.

F064863

(Super. Ct. No. F10905242)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Fresno County. Houry Sanderson, Judge.

Deborah Prucha, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Office of the State Attorney General, Sacramento, California, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Kane, Acting P.J., Detjen, J., and Franson, J.

Pursuant to a plea agreement, appellant, Caroline Barboza, pled no contest to individual counts of welfare fraud (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 10980, subd. (c)(2)) and perjury (Pen. Code, § 118, subd. (a)). In keeping with the plea agreement, the court suspended imposition of sentence and placed appellant on five years' probation, one of the terms of which was that she serve one day in county jail and 89 days in the adult offender work program.

The court denied appellant's request for a certificate of probable cause (Pen. Code, § 1237.5).

Appellant's appointed appellate counsel has filed an opening brief which summarizes the pertinent facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks that this court independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Appellant has not responded to this court's invitation to submit additional briefing.

FACTS

The report of the probation officer states the following: During the period of November 1, 2005, to December 31, 2006, appellant failed to accurately report to the Fresno County Department of Social Services income she received from employment. This resulted in "overpayments of public assistance funds" in the total amount of \$5,809.

DISCUSSION

Following independent review of the record, we have concluded that no reasonably arguable legal or factual issues exist.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.