Filed 3/21/12 P. v. Juarez CA4/3

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. JAVIER JUAREZ, Defendant and Appellant.	G045432 (Super. Ct. No. 09NF1698) O P I N I O N

Appeal from a judgment of the Superior Court of Orange County, James Edward Rogan, Judge. Affirmed.

Anita P. Jog, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

* * *

Javier Juarez pled guilty to six counts of performing a forcible lewd act on a child under age 14 (Pen. Code § 288, subd. (b)(1)). Other counts, alleging rape and lewd acts upon the same child, were dismissed. He executed a *Tahl* (*In re Tahl* (1969) 1 Cal.3d 122) form (advisement of rights and waiver) admitting the charges. The form indicated that upon acceptance of his plea, he would be sentenced to 18 years in prison. Juarez orally waived his rights and pled guilty. At his sentencing hearing, the court imposed the 18-year sentence.

Juarez subsequently filed a notice of appeal and requested a certificate of probable cause. The request was denied.

We appointed counsel to represent Juarez. Counsel filed a brief setting forth a statement of the case. She did not argue against her client, but advised this court she had been unable to find any issues to argue on appeal. We provided Juarez 30 days to suggest issues to us and/or file a written argument of his own. That period has now passed, and we have received no communication from him. We have conducted an independent review of our own as prescribed by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, but have been unable to identify a plausible issue. We therefore affirm.

Without a certificate of probable cause, there is no issue that could be raised as to the facts supporting the conviction. There were no search and seizure issues, and neither counsel nor we are able to find any postplea issues (see *People v. Panizzon* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 68).

In an abundance of caution, we have reviewed the plea itself and can find no infirmity. Juarez admitted he committed six separate lewd and lascivious acts upon the victim, and that he accomplished these acts through “force and violence” and with the intent of appealing to his sexual desires and those of the child. Juarez was carefully advised of his rights and waived them orally and in writing. The nature of the offense was spelled out in plain language and was easily understandable. There is nothing to

suggest Juarez' trial or appellate counsel failed him in any way. The judgment is affirmed.

BEDSWORTH, J.

WE CONCUR:

O'LEARY, P.J.

MOORE, J.