

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND MAY NOT BE  
CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c);  
Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24



DIVISION ONE  
FILED: 01/14/2010  
PHILIP G. URRY, CLERK  
BY: RWillingham

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION ONE

STATE OF ARIZONA, )  
 )  
 ) 1 CA-CR 09-0061  
 )  
 Appellee, ) DEPARTMENT D  
 )  
 ) **MEMORANDUM DECISION**  
 v. ) (Not for Publication -  
 ) Rule 111, Rules of the  
 ) Arizona Supreme Court)  
 JOHN EDWARD GRAHAM, )  
 )  
 )  
 Appellant, )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeal from the Superior Court of Maricopa County

Cause No. CR2007-114508-001 DT

The Honorable John R. Ditsworth, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

Terry Goddard, Attorney General Phoenix  
By Kent E. Cattani, Chief Counsel  
Attorneys for Appellee

James J. Haas, Maricopa County Public Defender Phoenix  
By Spencer D. Heffel, Deputy Public Defender  
Attorneys for Appellant

---

T H O M P S O N, Judge

¶1 This case comes to us as an appeal under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Counsel for John Edward

Graham (defendant) has advised us that, after searching the entire record, he has been unable to discover any arguable questions of law and has filed a brief requesting that this court conduct an *Anders* review of the record. Defendant has been afforded an opportunity to file a supplemental brief *in propria persona*, and he has not done so.

¶12 The Glendale Police pulled defendant over for a traffic violation. The police officer found a sunglass case containing tubing with a white residue that appeared to be from smoking methamphetamine and a chewing gum tin containing three small plastic bags in defendant's pocket. One of the plastic bags contained a white crystalline substance that resembled methamphetamine. The white substance from the gum tin was found to be a useable quantity of methamphetamine after testing by the Department of Public Safety criminalist.

¶13 Defendant was charged in count one with possession of dangerous drugs, a class 4 felony and in count two with possession of drug paraphernalia, a class 6 felony. Defendant was found guilty on both counts. Defendant was sentenced to two years of supervised probation.

¶14 We have read and considered counsel's brief and have searched the entire record for reversible error. See *Leon*, 104 Ariz. at 300, 451 P.2d at 881. We find none. All of the proceedings were conducted in compliance with the Arizona

Rules of Criminal Procedure. So far as the record reveals, defendant was adequately represented by counsel at all stages of the proceedings, and the sentence imposed was within the statutory limits. Defendant's counsel's obligations in this appeal are at an end and he need do no more than inform defendant of the outcome of this appeal and his future options, unless, upon review, counsel finds an issue appropriate for submission to the Arizona Supreme Court by petition for review. See *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85, 684 P.2d 154, 156-57 (1984).

¶15 We affirm the convictions and imposition of probation.

/s/

---

JON W. THOMPSON, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

---

JOHN C. GEMMILL, Presiding Judge

/s/

---

PATRICK IRVINE, Judge