

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
AUG 27 2013
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,)	2 CA-CR 2013-0042
)	DEPARTMENT B
Appellee,)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.)	Not for Publication
)	Rule 111, Rules of
ANTHONY JORDAN FLORES,)	the Supreme Court
)	
Appellant.)	
_____)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR20120989001

Honorable Michael O. Miller, Judge

AFFIRMED

West, Elsberry, Longenbaugh & Zickerman, PLLC
By Anne Elsberry

Tucson
Attorneys for Appellant

ESPINOSA, Judge.

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Anthony Flores was convicted of second-degree burglary and misdemeanor theft, committed in March 2012. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentences and placed Flores on concurrent, three-year terms of probation. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297, 451 P.2d 878 (1969), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530,

2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), stating she has reviewed the record and has found no arguable, meritorious issues to raise on appeal. She asks this court to search the record for fundamental error. Flores has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 We view 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). In summary, Tucson police officers responded to notification of a burglary in progress and found Flores near the apartment that had been burglarized. After he was advised of his rights pursuant to *Miranda*,¹ Flores identified the vehicle he had been driving, and property taken during the burglary was found in that vehicle.

¶3 We conclude substantial evidence supported Flores's convictions, *see* A.R.S. §§ 13-1507, 13-1802, and the dispositions were authorized by law, *see* A.R.S. § 13-902(A). In our examination of the record, we have found no fundamental or reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, Flores's convictions and dispositions are affirmed.

/s/ Philip G. Espinosa

PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/ Virginia C. Kelly

VIRGINIA C. KELLY, Presiding Judge

/s/ Peter J. Eckerstrom

PETER J. ECKERSTROM, Judge

¹*Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).