

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

KEVIN TYRIN BLAISE,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0346
Filed June 19, 2017

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Pinal County
No. S1100CR20153200
The Honorable Steven J. Fuller, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Flores & Clark, PC, Globe
By Daisy Flores
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. BLAISE
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

ESPINOSA, Judge:

¶1 Following a jury trial, appellant Kevin Blaise was convicted of second-degree burglary. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed him on a three-year term of supervised probation. 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), stating she has reviewed the record and has found no arguable question of law 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 fundamental error. Blaise has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 The evidence, viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining Blaise’s conviction, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), was sufficient to support the jury’s verdict. *See* A.R.S. § 13-1507. In October 2015, Blaise entered the victim’s home without permission and was seen leaving through a bedroom window. The victim later realized \$200 had been taken from his bedroom. The terms of Blaise’s probation are authorized by statute, *see* A.R.S. §§ 13-901(A), (B) and 13-902(A)(2), and were imposed in a lawful manner.

¶3 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, Blaise’s conviction and the imposition of probation are affirmed.