

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: 11-04-2010
RUTH WILLINGHAM,
ACTING CLERK
BY: GH

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION ONE

STATE OF ARIZONA,) 1 CA-CR 09-0861
) 1 CA-CR 09-0862
 Appellee,) (Consolidated)
)
 v.) DEPARTMENT A
)
 DOWAN LOUIS HALL,) **MEMORANDUM DECISION**
) (Not for Publication -
 Appellant.) Rule 111, Rules of the
) Arizona Supreme Court)
)
 _____)

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County

Cause Nos. CR 2001-001921 and CR 2008-117014-001 DT

The Honorable James T. Blomo, Judge *Pro Tempore*

AFFIRMED

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

Bruce Peterson, Legal Advocate Phoenix
By Frances J. Gray, Deputy Legal Advocate
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 Dowan Louis Hall (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.

¶12 Our obligation in this appeal is to review the entire record for reversible error. *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 537, ¶ 30, 2 P.3d 89, 96 (App. 1999). We view the facts in the light most favorable to sustaining the jury's verdict and resolve all inferences against defendant. *See State v. Guerra*, 161 Ariz. 289, 293, 778 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1989).

¶13 In CR 2008-117014-001 DT, defendant was charged by indictment with two counts of armed robbery, class 2 dangerous felonies, and one count of misconduct involving weapons, a class 4 dangerous felony. Defendant was on probation for criminal possession of a forgery device, a class 6 felony, in CR 2001-001921, when he committed the offense. The following evidence was presented at trial.

¶14 Defendant entered a Peter Piper Pizza and acted as if

he intended to order a pizza. A Peter Piper Pizza employee, L.C., recognized defendant as the same person who had robbed the restaurant three months prior. Defendant demanded that L.C. take him to "the back." A Peter Piper Pizza manager, G.M., was in the office in the back of the restaurant, and defendant told him to open the safe. L.C. and G.M. noticed that defendant was armed with a black handgun. Defendant said, "Give me the money and you won't get hurt."

¶15 L.C. retrieved the money out of the cash register in the front of the store while G.M. opened the safe for defendant. L.C. dialed 9-1-1 while she was at the cash register and left the phone off the hook. Once the safe was opened, defendant directed L.C. to place the money from the cash register and the safe into a bag. Defendant took the bag of money and left the restaurant through a back door.

¶16 A jury convicted defendant as charged. The trial court found that defendant violated the conditions of his probation in CR 2001-001921, and defendant admitted to having two other prior felony convictions. Defendant's probation was revoked, and he was sentenced to 1 year imprisonment, receiving 828 days of presentence incarceration credit. In CR 2008-117014-001 DT, defendant was sentenced to 20 years for count 1,

15.75 years for count 2, and 10 years for count 3, with counts 2 and 3 to run concurrently with each other. Defendant received 463 days of presentence incarceration credit with respect to counts 2 and 3. The trial court ordered that defendant's 20-year sentence for count 1 be served after the completion of the sentences for counts 2 and 3.

¶17 Defendant timely appealed his convictions and sentences. We have jurisdiction pursuant to Article 6, Section 9 of the Arizona Constitution and Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §§ 12-120.21(A)(1)(2003), 13-4031 (2010), and 13-4033(A)(1)(2010).

¶18 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 critical stages of the proceedings, and 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 end.

¶19 We affirm the convictions and sentences.

/s/

JON W. THOMPSON, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

DONN KESSLER, Presiding Judge

/s/

DANIEL A. BARKER, Judge