

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

SHAHROOZ ADRISAVI,

Defendant and Appellant.

G050030

(Super. Ct. No. 12HF1180)

O P I N I O N

Appeal from a judgment of the Superior Court of Orange County, David A. Hoffer, Judge. Affirmed.

Cindi B. Mishkin, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

* * *

Defendant Shahrooz Adrisavi was charged with stalking, making criminal threats and making harassing telephone calls. When he pled guilty, he offered the following facts as the basis for his plea: “In Orange County, California, on or about & between February 15, 2012 & February 16, 2012 I willfully & unlawfully & repeatedly & maliciously harassed Andrew B. & did unlawfully make a credible threat w/ the intent to place Andrew B. in reasonable fear for the safety of Andrew B[.] & the safety of Andrew B[.]’s immediate family & on February 16[,] 2012 I willfully & unlawfully threatened Andrew B[.] to commit a crime which would result in death & great bodily injury to Andrew B[.] w/ the specific intent that the statement be taken as a threat, & the statement was so unequivocal, unconditional, immediate & specific as to convey to the person threatened a gravity of purpose & an immediate prospect of execution of the threat, causing Andrew B[.] to reasonably be in sustained fear for his safety & the safety of his immediate family & on 2/15/12 I willfully & unlawfully w/ intent to annoy contacted Andrew B[.] by telephone & electronic communication & addressed obscene language & a threat to inflict injury to Andrew B[.]’s person.”

On his written guilty plea form, defendant initialed all of his constitutional rights, noting that he was giving them up. At the end of the form, right above his signature, he again stated he waived and gave up each of his rights in order to enter his guilty plea.

The court explained defendant’s constitutional rights, and defendant waived them. Defendant informed the court he was pleading guilty upon his own free will. Defendant then pled guilty to all three counts. The court placed him on three years’ formal probation. One of the terms and conditions of probation was serving 120 days in the Orange County jail. When the court sentenced defendant on March 11, 2014, the court stayed the jail time until April 25, 2014.

On April 25, 2014, defendant was again in court. He requested an additional stay of 60 days for serving his jail time. On the record, court and counsel discussed a letter written by a Dr. Farnoody, PhD who said defendant “is suffering from a high level of anxiety and also anger management issues.” The court denied the stay request.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed a brief which set forth the facts of the case. Counsel did not argue against the client, but raised no specific issues to argue on defendant’s behalf. We have examined the record and found no arguable issue. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was given 30 days to file written argument in defendant’s own behalf. That period has passed, and we have received no communication from defendant.

The judgment is affirmed.

MOORE, J.

WE CONCUR:

RYLAARSDAM, ACTING P. J.

THOMPSON, J.