

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SANTONIA DENISE HUMPHREY,

Defendant and Appellant.

E079237

(Super.Ct.No. FVI22000582)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Debra Harris,  
Judge. Affirmed.

Savannah Montanez, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant  
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Santonia Denise Humphrey admitted to violating the terms of her probation. Her attorney has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* and *Anders v. California*<sup>1</sup> informing this court they were unable to identify any errors and asking us to perform an independent review of the record. Based on our independent review of the record, we find no error and affirm.

### FACTS

In March 2022, Humphrey pled no contest to making criminal threats in violation of Penal Code section 422, subdivision (a). As part of her negotiated disposition, she received two years' formal probation. The court ordered her to report to the probation department within 48 hours of her release.

In April of the same year, the probation department petitioned to revoke Humphrey's probation because she failed to report upon release. The court summarily revoked her probation on April 6, and she was arrested on April 28.

On May 31, 2022, Humphrey waived her right to a hearing under *People v. Vickers* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 451 (*Vickers*) and admitted to violating probation. The court reinstated probation but added two new conditions: that Humphrey serve one year in jail and submit to Global Position System monitoring. The court reset the probation period so that it expired on May 8, 2024.

Humphrey appealed and requested a certificate of probable cause. The court granted the request for a certificate of probable cause.

---

<sup>1</sup> *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436; *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738.

ANALYSIS

We appointed counsel to represent Humphrey on appeal, and counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* and *Anders v. California*, setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts and potential arguable issues, and asking us to conduct an independent review of the record.

Counsel’s brief raised three potential issues for our consideration: whether the trial court correctly reset the probation expiration date, whether Humphrey knowingly and voluntarily waived her right to a *Vickers* hearing, and whether the court properly sentenced Humphrey according to the probation department’s recommendation. We offered Humphrey an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, and she has not done so.

We have independently reviewed the record for potential error as required by *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106 and find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to Humphrey.

DISPOSITION

We affirm the judgment.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAPHAEL  
\_\_\_\_\_ J.

We concur:

RAMIREZ  
\_\_\_\_\_ P. J.

SLOUGH  
\_\_\_\_\_ J.