

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

GREGORY WILLIAM RUDASILL,

Defendant and Appellant.

G050062

(Super. Ct. No. P-01198)

O P I N I O N

Appeal from a judgment of the Superior Court of Orange County, W.
Michael Hayes, Judge. Affirmed.

Richard Schwartzberg, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

* * *

The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Adult Parole Operations filed a petition to revoke Gregory William Rudasill's parole, alleging that he absconded from parole supervision (count 1) and that he violated a criminal protective order and special condition of his parole by contacting his victim, Karen Ting (count 2).

After conducting a trial on these allegations, the court found Rudasill had violated his parole conditions by absconding, and that he violated a special condition of his parole as alleged. The court revoked and reinstated parole conditioned on Rudasill serving a county jail term of 180 days, with custody credits of 39 actual days and 39 days of conduct credit.

Rudasill appealed the judgment and we appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel did not argue against his client, but advised the court that after a full review of the record he was unable to find an issue to argue on his client's behalf. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Rudasill was given an opportunity to file written argument in his own behalf, but he has not done so.

Rudasill's parole agent testified that he had ordered Rudasill (1) to report for weekly drug testing and (2) that he was absolutely prohibited from contacting Ting in any way. Rudasill failed to appear for drug testing on February 19 and 26, 2014. Ting testified that in mid-February 2014, Rudasill called her some 20 times and text messaged her over 100 times using five different telephones. Thus, substantial evidence supports the judgment of the court.

We have reviewed the entire appellate record and conducted an independent analysis of the court's findings and judgment. We concur with Rudasill's appointed counsel. There is no issue to argue on Rudasill's behalf.

The judgment is affirmed.

IKOLA, J.

WE CONCUR:

MOORE, ACTING P. J.

FYBEL, J.