

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: 09/01/09
PHILIP G. URRY, CLERK
BY: DN

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION ONE

STATE OF ARIZONA,)	1 CA-CR 09-0003
)	
Appellee,)	DEPARTMENT A
)	
)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
v.)	(Not for Publication -
)	Rule 111, Rules of the
ERIC CHRISTOPHER SALES,)	Arizona Supreme Court)
)	
Appellant.)	
)	

Appeal from the Superior Court of Navajo County

Cause No. S-0900-CR-0020040777

The Honorable John N. Lamb, Judge

AFFIRMED

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

Shaffery & Coronado, P.C.	Lakeside
By Emery K. La Barge	
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 Eric Christopher Sales (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.

¶12 Defendant was on intensive probation. Defendant failed to adhere to the conditions of his probation and his probation officer filed a petition to revoke probation. The trial court found that defendant violated his probation by testing positive for illegal drugs, associating with individuals with criminal records, refusing to give a urinalysis test, failing to pay court fines/fees, failing to remain at his residence, and failing to perform community service. The trial court revoked defendant's probation, sentenced him to two and one-half years in prison, and gave defendant credit for 209 days of presentence incarceration.

¶13 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. Defendant's counsel's obligations in this appeal are at an end and he need do no more than inform defendant of the outcome of this appeal and his future options, unless, upon review, counsel finds an issue appropriate for submission to the Arizona Supreme Court by petition for review. See *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85, 684 P.2d 154, 156-57 (1984).

¶4 We affirm the sentence and revocation of probation.

/s/

JON W. THOMPSON, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

PHILIP HALL, Presiding Judge

/s/

DANIEL A. BARKER, Judge