

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

KENNETH DEAN DAWSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

H041904

(Santa Clara County

Super. Ct. No. C1348958)

Defendant Kenneth Dean Dawson pleaded no contest to three counts of second degree robbery. (Pen. Code, §§ 211, 212.5, subd. (c).)¹ He also admitted having numerous prior “strike” felony convictions and five prior prison terms. (§§ 667, subds. (a), (b)-(i), 667.5, subd. (b).) The trial court struck all but one prior serious or violent felony conviction and imposed a total term of 20 years in prison.

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. Defendant personally responded by letter.

¹ Subsequent undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

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.) We conclude there is no arguable issue on appeal, and we will affirm the judgment.

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. *Facts of the Offense*²

On January 25, 2013, defendant entered the Chase Bank on Coleman Avenue in San José. He was wearing sunglasses and a hat, and he was covering his face with a rag. He appeared intoxicated and smelled of alcohol.

Defendant approached the tellers and yelled several times, “My friend¹’s outside and he’s got a gun. He’s going to shoot you guys, give me all the money!” He handed a plastic bag to one of the tellers, who filled it with money. He then did the same with two other tellers. The three tellers handed over a total of \$2,494.

Defendant fled the bank in a taxicab. Police apprehended him in the taxicab several blocks away.

B. *Procedural Background*

The prosecution charged defendant with three counts of second degree robbery. (§§ 211, 212.5, subd. (c).) The information alleged numerous enhancements: 12 prior serious or violent felony “strike” convictions (§§ 667, subd. (b)-(i), 667.5, subd. (c), 1192.7, subd. (c)); three prior serious felony convictions, or so-called “Proposition 8 strikes” (§§ 667, subd. (a), 1192.7); and five prior prison terms (§ 667.5, subd. (b).)

Defendant pleaded no contest to all three counts and admitted all enhancements. Defendant moved under section 1385 and *People v. Superior Court (Romero)* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 497, for dismissal of the prior strike convictions. Over the prosecution’s objection, the trial court struck 11 of the 12 prior strike convictions based on the age of the convictions.

² Our recitation of the facts is based on those set forth in the probation report.

The trial court denied probation and imposed an aggregate term of 20 years in prison, composed as follows. For the first robbery conviction, the court imposed the mitigated term of two years and doubled it to four years based on the remaining prior strike conviction. To that term, the court added one year for the prior prison term, for a total of five years on the first count. The court then imposed identical terms for the other two robbery convictions and ordered them to run concurrently. Finally, the court imposed consecutive five-year terms for three of the “Proposition 8 strike” convictions. The court struck the punishments on the remaining enhancements under section 1385.

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.

In his letter to the court, defendant made conflicting statements. First, he acknowledged that he faced potentially greater liability based on his numerous strike priors, and he expressed a desire not to disturb his sentence on appeal. But he also expressed a desire for further lenience and a reduction in his sentence. However, he raises no valid legal grounds in support of a sentence reduction. We conclude there is no arguable issue on appeal, and we will affirm the judgment.

III. DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

Márquez, J.

WE CONCUR:

Rushing, P. J.

Premo, J.