

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

DANIEL GIOVANNI GARZON,

Defendant and Appellant.

G050963

(Super. Ct. No. P01460)

O P I N I O N

Appeal from an order of the Superior Court of Orange County, Cheri T. Pham, Judge. Affirmed.

Jan B. Norman, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

* * *

Defendant Daniel Giovanni Garzon was on parole for committing a lewd act on a child under the age of 14 years in violation of Penal Code section 288, subdivision (a). Following a parole revocation hearing, the court found defendant had violated a parole condition which stated: “You shall not have contact with any minor female you know or reasonably should know is under the age of 18.” The court revoked and reinstated his parole on condition that he serve 102 days in the county jail and gave him 102 days credit for time served.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed a brief summarizing the proceedings and facts of the case and advised the court she found no arguable issues to assert on defendant’s behalf. (*Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.)

We notified defendant that he could file a supplemental brief on his own behalf. However the time to do so has passed and we have received no communication from him.

To assist us in our independent review of the record, counsel suggested we consider the following issues:

1. Was it an abuse of discretion for the court not to consider defendant’s constitutional challenge to his parole conditions?
2. Was it an abuse of discretion for the court not to continue the parole revocation hearing to give additional time for the People to respond to defendant’s challenge to the constitutionality of his parole conditions?
3. Was defendant required to serve the Attorney General’s Office with his request to modify the terms and conditions of his parole?

We have considered these issues and independently reviewed the record according to our obligations under *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738 and *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, but found no arguable issues on appeal.

The order revoking parole is affirmed.

THOMPSON, J.

WE CONCUR:

RYLAARSDAM, ACTING P. J.

MOORE, J.