


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

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION ONE



STATE OF ARIZONA, ) 1 CA-CR 09-0306  
)  
Appellee, ) DEPARTMENT D  
)  
v. ) **MEMORANDUM DECISION**  
) (Not for Publication -  
EDUARDO SANCHEZ-GONZALEZ, ) Rule 111, Rules of the  
) Arizona Supreme Court)  
Appellant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeal from the Superior Court of Maricopa County

Cause No. CR 2008-164960-001 DT

The Honorable James T. Blomo, Judge Pro Tempore

**AFFIRMED**

---

Terry Goddard, Attorney General Phoenix  
By Kent Cattani, Chief Counsel  
Criminal Appeals and Capital Litigation Section  
Attorneys for Appellee

James J. Haas, Maricopa County Public Defender Phoenix  
By Edith M. Lucero, 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), and *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297, 451 P.2d 878 (1969). Counsel for Eduardo Sanchez-Gonzalez

(defendant) 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 this court to 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.

#### **FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

¶2 Defendant was charged with robbery, a class 4 felony after forcibly removing a cell phone from the victim T.S. T.S. made contact with police responding to 9-1-1 calls about the incident. Defendant was apprehended nearby and the cell phone was recovered from a trash can defendant was standing next to. Police officers conducted a "one-on-one identification." Initially, T.S. stated that she was unable to make an identification, but later she identified defendant as the individual who had robbed her.

¶3 At trial, defendant testified that he did not rob T.S., that he'd never seen her before and asserted that he had also just been robbed of his cell phone.

¶4 A jury found defendant guilty as charged. The trial court suspended imposition of sentence and ordered defendant to serve two years probation. Defendant timely appealed his conviction and sentence. We have jurisdiction pursuant to

Article 6, Section 9 of the Arizona Constitution and Arizona Revised Statutes §§ 12-120.21(A)(1), 13-4031 and -4033(A)(1) (2010).

¶15 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 the sentence imposed was within the statutory limits. Pursuant to *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85, 684 P.2d 154, 156-57 (1984), defendant's counsel's obligations in this appeal are at an end.

¶16 We affirm the conviction and sentence.

/S/

---

JON W. THOMPSON, Judge

CONCURRING:

/S/

---

MICHAEL J. BROWN, Presiding Judge

/S/

---

SHELDON H. WEISBERG, Judge