

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

STEVE BRITO ORANTEZ,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0132
Filed December 16, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR20142008001
The Honorable Paul E. Tang, Judge
The Honorable Casey F. McGinley, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

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

STATE v. ORANTEZ
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

M I L L E R, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Steve Orantez was convicted of possession of a narcotic drug and possession of drug paraphernalia. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed Orantez on concurrent three-year terms of probation.

¶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 he 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, he 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. Orantez 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 April 2014, during a search of a home in which Orantez was staying, police officers found approximately a quarter gram of cocaine in two plastic baggies, which Orantez admitted belonged to him. A.R.S. §§ 13-3401(5), (20)(z); 13-3408(A); 13-3415(A), (F). The terms of his probation are authorized by statute and were imposed in a lawful manner. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-901(A), (B); 13-902(A)(4); 13-3401(36)(b); 13-3408(B)(1), (C); 13-3415(A).

¶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*

STATE v. ORANTEZ
Decision of the Court

requires court to search record for fundamental error). Accordingly, we affirm Orantez's conviction and disposition.