IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

PAUL JEFFERY WILLIAMS,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0362
Filed April 29, 2015

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pinal County
No. S1100CR201201502
The Honorable Gilberto V. Figueroa, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Lynn T. Hamilton, Mesa
Counsel for Appellant

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Kelly authored the decision of the Court, in which Judge Howard and Judge Vásquez concurred.

K E L L Y, Presiding Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Paul Williams was convicted of aggravated assault, a dangerous class three felony offense. The trial court sentenced him to a 6.5-year prison term with 115 days of presentence incarceration credit. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California,* 386 U.S. 738 (1967), avowing she has reviewed the record and found no arguable issue to raise on appeal and asking that we search the record for "error." In compliance with *State v. Clark,* 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d 89, 97 (App. 1999), counsel also 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." Williams did not file a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to upholding the jury's verdict, *see State v. Tamplin,* 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), the evidence established that in July 2012[1] Williams struck the victim with a large bottle of beer, injuring her eye, which "exploded" the following day. The victim testified she has "a detached retina and a ruptured globe, so there is no eyesight to my eye, period, now." We conclude there was substantial evidence to prove the elements necessary for Williams's

[1] Although the written sentencing order states the offense occurred on "October 11, 2012," the record is clear the offense occurred instead on July 11, 2012.

conviction, *see* A.R.S. §§ 13-1203, 13-1204(A)(2),[2] and the sentence is lawful and was imposed in a lawful manner, *see* A.R.S. § 13-704(A).

¶3 Our examination of the record pursuant to *Anders* has revealed no reversible error or arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, we affirm Williams's conviction and sentence.

[2]We refer to the statute in effect at the time of Williams's offense. *See* 2011 Ariz. Sess. Laws, ch. 90, § 6; 1978 Ariz. Sess. Laws, ch. 201, § 129.