



then agreed to the plea, which the court accepted. The evidence against defendant was overwhelming. Besides his admission of having sexual intercourse with the 12-year-old victim, the victim subsequently gave birth to a child carrying his DNA.

¶ 4 On October 8, 2009, the court received a letter from defendant requesting a new attorney based on ineffective assistance of counsel. The court did not inquire into the complaint and proceeded to the sentencing hearing. Defendant was subsequently sentenced to 16 years' imprisonment.

¶ 5 On February 2, 2010, defendant filed a *pro se* motion to withdraw his plea and to reconsider sentence. He again requested a new attorney. A new attorney was appointed, and new counsel filed a motion to reconsider sentence for defendant. Absent from this motion was the Supreme Court Rule 604(d) certification required in all postplea motions. See Ill. S. Ct. R. 604(d) (eff. July 1, 2006). After a hearing on the motion to reconsider sentence, the court denied defendant's motion.

¶ 6 As previously stated, defendant raises six issues on appeal. We need not address his contentions, as the State concedes defense counsel failed to file the required Rule 604(d) certificate of compliance. Rule 604(d) requires defense counsel to file a certificate stating that he or she has consulted with the defendant, ascertained his contentions of error, reviewed the record, and made any amendments necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in the proceedings. Ill. S. Ct. R. 604(d) (eff. July 1, 2006). Counsel must strictly comply with the rule. *People v. Janes*, 158 Ill. 2d 27, 34-35, 630 N.E.2d 790, 793 (1994). We cannot assume or infer compliance, because any issue not raised in the motion to withdraw the guilty plea or motion to reconsider the sentence is waived. *People v. Prather*, 379 Ill. App. 3d 763, 768, 887 N.E.2d 44, 47 (2008). Remand is therefore required for compliance with the certification requirements of Rule 604(d).

¶ 7 For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the judgment of the circuit court of Richland

County with respect to defendant's *ex post facto* sentencing issues and request for new counsel, but remand this cause for compliance with the certification requirements of Rule 604(d).

¶ 8 Affirmed in part; cause remanded in part for compliance with Rule 604(d).