

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

SHAWMAINE EUSTACE ARDEL MOORE,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0081
Filed September 15, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR20152653001
The Honorable Teresa Godoy, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Law Offices of Cornelia Wallis Honchar, P.C., Tucson
By Cornelia Wallis Honchar
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. MOORE
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

ESPINOSA, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Shawmaine Moore was convicted of three counts of possession of a deadly weapon by a prohibited possessor. The trial court sentenced him to a ten-year prison term for each offense, to be served concurrently.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), asserting she has reviewed the record but found no arguable issue to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, she has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record” and asks this court to search the record for error. Moore has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the jury’s verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), sufficient evidence supports them here. In June 2015, police officers found at least three firearms in a vehicle registered to Moore, who previously had been convicted of a felony and was on probation at the time. Surveillance video showed Moore in the vehicle handling two of the weapons, and he admitted to police that he had handled the third, all in violation of A.R.S. §§ 13-3101(A)(1), (A)(7)(b); 13-3102(A)(4). The evidence also supports the trial court’s finding that he had at least three historical prior felony convictions. His sentences are within the statutory range and were properly imposed. A.R.S. §§ 13-703(C), (J), (O); 13-3102(M).

STATE v. MOORE
Decision of the Court

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental error and found none. *See State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575, 694 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1985). Accordingly, Moore's convictions and sentences are affirmed.