

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

FILED BY CLERK

MAY -2 2013

COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	2 CA-CR 2012-0058
	)	DEPARTMENT A
Appellee,	)	
	)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.	)	Not for Publication
	)	Rule 111, Rules of
ANTONIO M. SALLINS,	)	the Supreme Court
	)	
Appellant.	)	
_____	)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR20112323001

Honorable Michael O. Miller, Judge

AFFIRMED AS CORRECTED

Lori J. Lefferts, Pima County Public Defender  
By Lisa M. Hise

Tucson  
Attorneys for Appellant

E C K E R S T R O M, Presiding Judge.

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Antonio Sallins was convicted of three counts of aggravated assault, all of which were dangerous offenses, and one count of disorderly conduct. The trial court sentenced him to enhanced, partially mitigated, six-year prison

terms for the aggravated assault convictions, to be served concurrently, followed by a three-year term of intensive probation for the disorderly conduct.<sup>1</sup>

¶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 she has reviewed the record and found no arguably meritorious issues for appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, she has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record,” 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, and asks this court to search the record for error. Sallins has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to upholding the jury’s verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), the evidence established that on the morning of July 2, 2011, Sallins, who appeared drunk, approached a man outside a restaurant and asked him for a dollar. When the request was refused, Sallins drew a knife and asked again before the man walked away and into the restaurant. Shortly thereafter, Sallins appeared at a nearby hotel, where he followed two guests into the hotel’s breakfast area, sat with them, and began touching some of the food they had prepared for themselves. When the front desk clerk tried to speak with Sallins, he pulled a knife from his pocket and brandished it at her and other hotel patrons, cutting two of

---

<sup>1</sup>The sentencing minute entry erroneously states Sallins’s probation would “commenc[e] on February 27, 2012,” the date of sentencing. But the trial court clearly expressed its intent to impose a term of probation to be served consecutively to the concurrent prison terms by ordering that probation “begin[] upon [his] absolute discharge” from prison. Accordingly, we correct page three of the court’s February 27, 2012 sentencing minute entry by replacing the probation commencement date of February 27, 2012, with the phrase “defendant’s absolute discharge from prison.” *See State v. Ovante*, 231 Ariz. 180, ¶ 39, 291 P.3d 974, 982 (2013) (correcting clerical error to reflect court’s clear intent).

them on the hand. We conclude substantial evidence supported the jury's verdicts. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-1203(A)(1), (2), 13-1204(A)(2), 13-2904(A)(6). Sallins was represented by counsel, and his sentences are authorized by statute and were imposed in a lawful manner. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-704(A), 13-902(A)(4).

¶4 In our examination of the record, we have found no reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 30, 2 P.3d at 96. Accordingly, we affirm Sallins's convictions, sentences, and disposition of probation as corrected.

*/s/ Peter J. Eckerstrom*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PETER J. ECKERSTROM, Presiding Judge

CONCURRING:

*/s/ Joseph W. Howard*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOSEPH W. HOWARD, Chief Judge

*/s/ Garye L. Vásquez*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Judge