

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RODERICK LEE RAMOZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

H040749

(Santa Clara County

Super. Ct. No. C1368825)

Defendant Roderick Lee Ramoz pleaded no contest to possession of a firearm as a felon and possession of ammunition by a prohibited person. (Pen. Code, §§ 29800, subd. (a)(1), 30305, subd. (a)(1); subsequent undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.) The trial court granted a three-year term of probation to include 120 days in county jail as a condition of probation. The court also imposed a restitution fine of \$308 and various other fees totaling \$269.75.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant in this court. Appointed counsel filed an opening brief stating the case and the facts, but raising no specific issues on appeal. We notified defendant of his right to submit written argument on his own behalf within 30 days. That period has elapsed, and we have received no written argument from defendant.

We have reviewed the entire record under *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). (See also *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106 (*Kelly*).) We conclude there is no arguable issue on appeal, and we will therefore affirm.

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The prosecution charged defendant by felony complaint on November 1, 2013. Count One alleged that on or about October 29, 2013, defendant, an ex-felon, possessed nine rifles and seven shotguns in violation of section 29800, subdivision (a)(1). Count Two alleged that defendant possessed ammunition as a prohibited person in violation of section 30305, subdivision (a)(1). Apart from the allegations in the complaint, the record contains no statement of the underlying facts of the offenses.

On December 5, 2013, defendant pleaded no contest to both counts. On February 8, 2014, the trial court granted a three-year term of probation to include 120 days in county jail as a condition of probation. The court imposed a restitution fine of \$308, a court security fee of \$80, a criminal conviction assessment of \$60, and criminal justice administration fee of \$129.75.

II. DISCUSSION

We reviewed the entire record under *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436. We find defendant was adequately advised of his rights and the consequences of his plea. Defendant freely, knowingly, and intelligently waived his rights and entered his plea. No sentencing error appears. We conclude there is no arguable issue on appeal. (See also *Kelly, supra*, 40 Cal.4th at p. 124.)

III. DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

Márquez, J.

WE CONCUR:

Rushing, P. J.

Elia, J.