

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

LAWRENCE RACHAL FIELDS-LANE,

Defendant and Appellant.

G052147

(Super. Ct. No. R-01023)

O P I N I O N

Appeal from a judgment of the Superior Court of Orange County, Richard M. King, Judge. Affirmed.

Jeffrey S. Kross, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

We appointed counsel to represent Lawrence Rachal Fields-Lane on appeal. Counsel filed a brief that set forth the facts of the case. Counsel did not argue against his client but advised the court he found no issues to argue on his behalf. We gave Fields-Lane 30 days to file written argument on his own behalf. That time has passed, and Fields-Lane has not filed any written argument.

Counsel filed a brief following the procedures outlined in *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). The court in *Wende* explained a *Wende* brief is one that sets forth a summary of proceedings and facts but raises no specific issues. Under these circumstances, the court must conduct an independent review of the entire record. When the appellant himself raises specific issues in a *Wende* proceeding, we must expressly address them in our opinion and explain why they fail. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110, 120, 124.) Fields-Lane did not raise any issues himself.

Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*), to assist the court with its independent review, counsel provided the court with information as to issues that might arguably support an appeal. Counsel raised one issue: whether the trial court erred by revoking and reinstating Fields-Lane's postrelease community supervision (PRCS) rather than discharging him on May 25, 2015.

We have reviewed the record in accordance with our obligations under *Wende* and *Anders*, and the information counsel provided. We found no arguable issues on appeal. The judgment is affirmed.

FACTS

Fields-Lane pleaded guilty to stalking (Pen. Code, § 646.9, subd. (b)),¹ on January 5, 2012, and the trial court sentenced him to two years in prison. The maximum sentence for felony stalking was four years. He was released from prison and placed on PRCS on April 13, 2012. On April 24, 2015, the Orange County Probation Department

¹

All further statutory references are to the Penal Code.

(the Department) filed a petition to revoke PRCS. The petition alleged Fields-Lane violated PRCS by resisting arrest (§ 148, subd. (a)(1)), when he was arrested on April 19, 2015, for threatening to kill his sister, as well as having failed to report for PRCS between April 1 and April 15, 2015. The Department noted that in the intervening time since his release on PRCS, Fields-Lane “failed to report and test on multiple occasions, failed to submit to search and seizure, and he has violated numerous laws, including [section] 273.6[, subd.] (a) . . . , [section] 273.5[, subd.] (a) . . . , [section] 236 . . . , [section] 69 . . . , [section] 243[, subd.] (b) . . . , and [section] 243[, subd. (e)] (1)” On April 28, 2015, the trial court summarily revoked Fields-Lane’s PRCS and set a formal revocation hearing.

In his points and authorities, Fields-Lane argued that under section 3456, the trial court lacked jurisdiction to extend his PRCS beyond the statutory three-year period specified in section 3456, subdivision (a), and PRCS should be terminated upon the admission of the alleged violation. Fields-Lane admitted that during his PRCS period, he had absconded for a total of 42 days. Additionally, he conceded his PRCS had been revoked and he had formal violations on five separate occasions, resulting in jail terms of 60, 120, 180, 180, and 180 days, respectively.

At the formal revocation hearing, the trial court indicated that if Fields-Lane admitted violating his PRCS conditions, the court would revoke and reinstate the PRCS, with credit for time served of 18 actual days and 18 days conduct credit. It further indicated it would defer ruling on whether to terminate PRCS. Fields-Lane admitted the alleged PRCS violations, and the court ruled as previously indicated. Later that day, the court filed a minute order denying Fields-Lane’s request to terminate PRCS. Fields-Lane filed a timely notice of appeal.

DISCUSSION

We have reviewed the information provided by counsel and have independently examined the record. We found no arguable issues. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

O'LEARY, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

RYLAARSDAM, J.

FYBEL, J.