

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

CHARLES ROBERT RENAULT,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0247
Filed May 16, 2016

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. CR20143319001

The Honorable Teresa Godoy, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Steven R. Sonenberg, Pima County Public Defender
By Frank P. Leto, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. RENAULT
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Staring authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Howard and Judge Espinosa concurred.

STARING, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Charles Renault was convicted of failure to obtain an annual, non-operating identification license or driver's license after having been convicted of child molestation. The trial court found he had one historical prior felony conviction and sentenced him to an enhanced, mitigated term of nine months in prison.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), avowing he has reviewed the record and has found no meritorious legal issues to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, he has provided a factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record, and he asks this court to search the record for error. Renault has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 We conclude substantial evidence supported the jury's verdicts. Before trial, Renault waived his right to counsel and the trial court granted his request to represent himself with the assistance of advisory counsel. After an evaluation pursuant to Rule 11, Ariz. R. Crim. P., he was found competent to stand trial based on the opinions of two examiners. At trial, evidence was presented that Renault had been convicted of child molestation in 1995; that he had obtained the required identification in 2011 and 2012 and, on those occasions, had initialed a form acknowledging his understanding that he was required to obtain new identification "every year" after his initial registration, but that he had failed to obtain the required identification card after 2012. See A.R.S. § 13-3821(A) and (J); 13-

STATE v. RENAULT
Decision of the Court

3824(B). We further conclude Renault's sentences are authorized by statute and were imposed in a lawful manner. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-105(22)(a)(v), 13-703(B) and (I).

¶4 In our examination of the record, we have found no reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, we affirm Renault's conviction and sentence.