

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

ANGELO ALEXANDER,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0454
Filed September 18, 2015

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. CR20140345001
The Honorable Casey F. McGinley, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

West, Elsberry, Longenbaugh & Zickerman, PLLC, Tucson
By Anne Elsberry
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. ALEXANDER
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Howard authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Vásquez and Judge Kelly¹ concurred.

H O W A R D, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Angelo Alexander was convicted of aggravated assault with a deadly weapon and weapons misconduct—possession of a firearm by a prohibited possessor. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent prison terms, the longer of which was 7.5 years.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), asserting she has reviewed the record but found no arguable issue to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, she has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record” and asks this court to search the record for error. Alexander has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), sufficient evidence supports the jury’s verdicts here. In January 2014, Alexander—who had been convicted of a felony in California—shot the victim several times in the leg with a handgun. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-1204(A)(2); 13-3102(A)(4). Sufficient evidence also supported the trial court’s finding that Alexander had a prior felony conviction. And his sentences are within the statutory limits and were imposed properly. A.R.S. §§ 13-703(I); 13-704(A); 13-1204(D); 13-3102(M).

¹The Hon. Virginia C. Kelly, a retired judge of this court, is called back to active duty to serve on this case pursuant to orders of this court and our supreme court.

STATE v. ALEXANDER
Decision of the Court

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental error and found none. *See State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575, 694 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1985) (*Anders* requires court to search record for fundamental error). Accordingly, we affirm Alexander's convictions and sentences.