

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

JOEL PERALTA VALLES,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0113
Filed December 23, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR20132823005
The Honorable Kenneth Lee, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Steven R. Sonenberg, Pima County Public Defender
By Frank P. Leto, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. VALLES
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Espinosa authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Howard and Judge Staring concurred.

ESPINOSA, Judge:

¶1 Following a jury trial, appellant Joel Valles was convicted of possession of four pounds or more of marijuana for sale and conspiracy to possess four pounds or more of marijuana for sale. The trial court sentenced him to mitigated, concurrent prison terms of three years each. 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), stating he “has reviewed the record and is unable to find a meritorious issue for appeal.” Counsel has asked us to search the record for reversible error. Valles has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, the evidence was sufficient to support the jury’s finding of guilt. See *State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999). The evidence presented at trial showed that police officers detained Valles who, along with several others, had fled from a house in which they found drug ledgers, air freshener, tape and plastic wrap, a box cutter, a scale, 247 pounds of marijuana wrapped in bales, a gun, and \$8,500 in cash. Valles’s cell phone was found in the house with a calculator application open and showing numbers that totaled 8,500. An officer testified that based on his training and experience the circumstances were consistent with the marijuana being for sale. We further conclude the sentence imposed is within the statutory limit. See A.R.S. §§ 13-702(D); 13-1003; 13-3405(A)(2), (B)(6).

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have

STATE v. VALLES
Decision of the Court

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, Valles's convictions and sentences are affirmed.