

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: 09/28/2010
RUTH WILLINGHAM,
ACTING CLERK
BY: GH

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION ONE

STATE OF ARIZONA,) 1 CA-CR 09-0926
)
Appellee,) DEPARTMENT D
)
v.) **MEMORANDUM DECISION**
) (Not for Publication -
RONALD DARNELL WORDLAW,) Rule 111, Rules of the
) Arizona Supreme Court)
Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the Superior Court of Maricopa County

Cause No. CR2006-108910-001 DT

The Honorable Lisa Ann Vandenberg, Judge Pro Tem

AFFIRMED

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

James J. Haas, Maricopa County Public Defender Phoenix
By Thomas Baird, 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 Ronald Darnell Wordlaw (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 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. For the following reasons, we affirm.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

¶2 Defendant was charged by indictment with taking the identity of another, a class 4 felony. The following evidence was presented at trial.¹

¶3 Defendant was questioned while in custody regarding an unrelated bank fraud investigation. Defendant admitted to having various forms of identification in his hotel room that were not his own. Defendant signed a consent to search form, and he accompanied Detective C.B. of the Phoenix Police Department and Agent S.H. of the F.B.I. to his hotel room. Defendant turned over possession of various forms of identification and credit cards in the name of the victim, D.S. At trial, D.S. testified

¹ 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) (citation omitted).

that the identification and credit cards belonged to him. He also testified that he did not give defendant permission to possess the items.

¶4 At trial, Detective C.B. testified that defendant said he had the identification in order to use it for bank fraud. Agent S.H. also testified that defendant "definitely was talking about [the identification] in terms of fraud"

¶5 A jury convicted defendant as charged. The trial court found that defendant had two prior felony convictions and sentenced him to ten years imprisonment. Additionally, the court credited defendant with 291 days of presentence incarceration. 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).

DISCUSSION

¶6 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. 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. Defendant has thirty days from the date of this decision in which to proceed, if he desires, with a *pro se* motion for reconsideration or petition for review.

CONCLUSION

¶7 We affirm the conviction and sentence.

/s/

JON W. THOMPSON, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

MICHAEL J. BROWN, Presiding Judge

/s/

SHELDON H. WEISBERG, Judge