

P O R T L E Y, Judge

¶1 This is an appeal under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) and *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297, 451 P.2d 878 (1969). Counsel for Defendant Alfredo Hinojos Salayandia has advised us that, after searching the entire record, she has been unable to discover any arguable questions of law, and has filed a brief requesting us to conduct an *Anders* review of the record. Defendant did not avail himself of the opportunity we provided to file a supplemental brief.

FACTS¹

¶2 Defendant was a passenger in a red truck that sped around the victim, who was driving home during the evening of May 20, 2008. The truck blocked her travel, and the Defendant and the driver demanded her purse and cell phone while they were holding guns. The two then helped her remove her child from the car seat and drove away in her vehicle. After they left, the victim took her child to her aunt's house nearby and called 9-1-1.

¶3 After the police relayed the incident over the airwaves, the red truck was located by an air unit and stopped by Phoenix patrol officers. Defendant was driving the truck, and the officers found the victim's wallet and identification inside the truck.

¹ We review the facts in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict. See *State v. Guerra*, 161 Ariz. 289, 293, 778 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1989).

¶14 Within an hour of the carjacking, the Glendale police took the victim to Phoenix, presented two people in separate show-ups, and asked her whether she could identify either person. She identified both men as the two involved in the carjacking. Defendant was arrested, and subsequently indicted for armed robbery, a dangerous offense; theft of a means of transportation; and misconduct involving weapons.

¶15 After a *Dessureault*² hearing the trial court found by clear and convincing evidence that the show-ups were not unduly suggestive. Defendant subsequently went to trial and the jury convicted him of armed robbery, a dangerous offense, and theft of a means of transportation; they acquitted him of misconduct involving weapons. A month later, he stipulated to two prior felonies and, after a proper allocution, the trial court accepted the stipulation.

¶16 Defendant filed an unsuccessful motion for new trial. He requested a mitigation hearing and, after the hearing, was sentenced to an aggravated prison term of twenty-one years on the armed robbery charge concurrent with an eleven and one-quarter years prison term for the theft of the car. He was also credited with 261 days of presentence incarceration.

² *State v. Dessureault*, 104 Ariz. 380, 453 P.2d 951 (1969).

DISCUSSION

¶7 We have read and considered the opening brief, and have searched the entire record for reversible error. See *Leon*, 104 Ariz. at 300, 451 P.2d at 881. We have found no reversible error by the experienced trial judge. All of the proceedings were conducted in compliance with the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure. Moreover, the record designated on appeal reveals that Defendant was represented by counsel at all stages of the proceedings, and the sentence imposed was within the statutory limits.

CONCLUSION

¶8 After this decision has been filed, counsel's obligation to represent Defendant in this appeal has ended. Counsel need do no more than inform Defendant of the status of the appeal and Defendant's future options, unless counsel's review reveals an issue appropriate for submission to the Arizona Supreme Court by petition for review. See *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 585, 684 P.2d 154, 157 (1984). Defendant can, if desired, file a motion for reconsideration or petition for review pursuant to the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure.

¶19 Accordingly, we affirm Defendant's conviction and sentence.

/s/

MAURICE PORTLEY, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

DIANE M. JOHNSEN, Presiding Judge

/s/

DANIEL A. BARKER, Judge