

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

HECTOR ANGEL SANDOVAL,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0096
Filed November 24, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR20132846001

The Honorable Casey F. McGinley, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

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

STATE v. SANDOVAL
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

HOWARD, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Hector Sandoval was convicted of armed robbery, aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, aggravated robbery, and two counts of theft. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent prison terms, the longest of which is 15.75 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 arguably meritorious 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. Sandoval 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. In June 2013, in separate incidents on the same day, Sandoval and three others robbed two victims at gunpoint, taking property from each. A.R.S. §§ 13-1203(A)(2); 13-1204(A)(2); 13-1802(A); 13-1902(A); 13-1903(A); 13-1904(A). And sufficient evidence supported the trial court’s finding that Sandoval had at least two historical prior felony convictions. A.R.S. § 13-105(22).

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. SANDOVAL
Decision of the Court

Sandoval's prison terms were within the statutory limits and imposed properly. A.R.S. §§ 13-703(C), (J); 13-707(A); 13-1204(D); 13-1802(G); 13-1903(B); 13-1904(B).

¶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 Sandoval's convictions and sentences.