

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. 31.34



DIVISION ONE
FILED: 03/06/2012
RUTH A. WILLINGHAM,
CLERK
BY: DLL

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION ONE

STATE OF ARIZONA,) No. 1 CA-CR 11-0273
)
Appellee,) DEPARTMENT A
)
v.) MEMORANDUM DECISION
)
CHRISTI CAY CARTER,) (Not for Publication -
) Rule 111, Rules of the
Appellant.) Arizona Supreme Court)
)

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County

Cause No. CR 2010-132574-003 DT

The Honorable Joseph C. Welty, Judge

AFFIRMED

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

Eaton Law Office Phoenix
By Pamela J. Eaton
Attorneys for Appellant

T I M M E R, Judge

¶1 Christi Cay Carter appeals from her convictions and resulting sentences after a jury found her guilty of one count

of possession of dangerous drugs, one count of misconduct involving weapons, and two counts of possession of drug paraphernalia. Carter's counsel filed a brief in accordance with *Smith v. Robbins*, 528 U.S. 259 (2000), *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), advising this court that after a search of the entire record on appeal, she found no arguable question of law that is not frivolous. This court granted Carter an opportunity to file a supplemental brief in propria persona, but she has not done so. We have jurisdiction to consider this appeal pursuant to Article 6, Section 9, of the Arizona Constitution and Arizona Revised Statutes ("A.R.S.") sections 12-120.21(A)(1) (2003), 13-4031, and -4033 (2010). For the following reasons, we affirm.

DISCUSSION

¶2 We have read and considered counsel's brief and have searched the entire record for reversible error. *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297, 300, 451 P.2d 878, 881 (1969). We find none. The record shows that Carter was represented by counsel at all stages of the proceedings and on appeal, and that the trial court afforded Carter all her rights under the constitution, our statutes, and the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure. Carter's disposition falls within the range prescribed by law. *Clark*, 196 Ariz. at 541, ¶ 50, 2 P.3d at 100.

CONCLUSION

¶3 After the filing of this decision, counsel's obligations pertaining to Carter's representation in this appeal have ended. Counsel need do no more than inform Carter of the status of the appeal and Carter's future options, unless counsel's review reveals an issue appropriate for submission to the Arizona Supreme Court by petition for review. *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85, 684 P.2d 154, 156-57 (1984). Carter shall have thirty days from the date of this decision to proceed, if she desires, with an in propria persona motion for reconsideration or petition for review.

¶4 Accordingly, we affirm Carter's convictions and sentences.

/s/
Ann A. Scott Timmer, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/
Maurice Portley, Presiding Judge

/s/
Andrew W. Gould, Judge