

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: 12/21/2010  
RUTH WILLINGHAM,  
ACTING CLERK  
BY: GH

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION ONE

STATE OF ARIZONA, ) 1 CA-CR 09-0889  
)  
Appellee, ) DEPARTMENT A  
)  
v. ) **MEMORANDUM DECISION**  
) (Not for Publication -  
PAUL VINCENT WEST, JR., ) Rule 111, Rules of the  
) Arizona Supreme Court)  
Appellant. )  
)  
)  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County

Cause No. CR 2009-124034-002 DT

The Honorable Susan Brnovich, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

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

Sharmila Roy Laveen  
Attorney 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 Paul Vincent West, Jr. (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.

¶2 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).

¶3 Defendant was charged by indictment with three counts of armed robbery, class 2 dangerous felonies. The separate counts are with respect to each of three victims, arising from the same incident. The following evidence was presented at trial.

¶4 S.M. received text messages from a former co-worker, Tommy. The text messages indicated that Tommy was having car trouble and asked S.M. for help. S.M. and two of her friends,

V.G. and L.C., were close by, and they arrived at the apartment complex where Tommy had asked them to meet him. Shortly after they arrived, Tommy appeared and got in the vehicle and sat next to S.M. in the backseat.

¶5 Then defendant walked up to the driver window of the vehicle, pulled out a firearm, and cocked it. Defendant pressed the firearm into V.G's side, and also pointed it at L.C. While still in the backseat, Tommy pulled out a firearm and rested it on his thigh. Defendant demanded that the victims give him their "stuff." Defendant took a cell phone from each victim and some money. Defendant and Tommy walked away from the scene together.

¶6 A jury convicted defendant as charged. The trial court sentenced him to three concurrent terms of sixteen years imprisonment. The court credited defendant with 119 days of presentence incarceration. Defendant timely appealed his convictions and sentences. 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).

¶7 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 sentences imposed were 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.

¶8 We affirm the convictions and sentences.

/s/

---

JON W. THOMPSON, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

---

DONN KESSLER, Presiding Judge

/s/

---

DANIEL A. BARKER, Judge