IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

RONNY SLATE RAMIREZ,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0293
Filed March 18, 2015

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pinal County
No. S1100CR201100775
The Honorable Joseph R. Georgini, Judge

AFFIRMED AS CORRECTED

COUNSEL

Harriette P. Levitt, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

E C K E R S T R O M, Chief Judge:

¶1 Ronny Ramirez was convicted after a jury trial of theft of property with a value of $25,000 or more but less than $100,000. The trial court sentenced Ramirez to a presumptive prison term of five years[1] with 1,222 days of presentence incarceration credit, and ordered him to pay restitution in the amount of $102,020.79.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating she has reviewed the record but found "no arguable issues on appeal" and asking this court "to search the entire record for error." In compliance with *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d 89, 97 (App. 1999), counsel has provided "a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record, [so] this court can satisfy itself that counsel has in fact thoroughly reviewed the record." Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have reviewed the record in its entirety and we conclude it supports counsel's recitation of the facts. Ramirez has filed a supplemental brief that appears to challenge the sufficiency of the evidence supporting his conviction.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to upholding the jury's verdict, *see State v. Haight-Gyuro,* 218 Ariz. 356, ¶ 2, 186 P.3d 33, 34 (App. 2008), the evidence established that in August 2009, the victim hired Ramirez as a handyman. On March 24, 2011, the victim noticed that two rings were missing from her jewelry box, which she kept in the same room in which Ramirez had been working that day; she had not given Ramirez permission to open the box or to remove anything from it. Several other pieces of jewelry belonging to the victim, which she did not realize were missing, were ultimately

---

[1]This sentence was imposed upon resentencing.

found in Ramirez's possession, including in his truck and residence. The value of the recovered items was $16,125, while the rings stolen on March 24, 2011, along with other stolen pieces of jewelry that were never recovered, were valued by the victim at $198,474. The evidence is sufficient to support the jury's verdict, and Ramirez's sentence is within the prescribed statutory range and was lawfully imposed. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-1802(A)(1), (G),[2] 13-702(D).

¶4 In our review of the record, however, we noted that the sentencing minute entry does not reflect the same dates as the amended indictment—specifically that the theft offense (amended Count Two) occurred on or between August 2009 and April 5, 2011, rather than on or between April 4 and 5, 2011, as originally alleged. The sentencing minute entry will therefore be corrected to reflect the amended dates for Count Two as on or between August 2009 and April 5, 2011.

¶5 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have found no reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See* 386 U.S. at 744. Therefore, we affirm Ramirez's conviction and sentence, as corrected.

[2]We cite the current version of our theft statute, as its relevant provisions have not changed since Ramirez committed the offense.