

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

ESEQUIEL PAUL FLORES,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0203  
Filed December 30, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Gila County

No. CR201300370

The Honorable Timothy M. Wright, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Emily Danies, Tucson  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. FLORES  
Decision of the Court

---

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

---

STARING, Judge:

¶1 Esequiel Flores was convicted after a jury trial of disorderly conduct with a deadly weapon or dangerous instrument, a knife, and the jury found it to be a domestic violence offense. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed Flores on a three-year term 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 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. Flores did not file a supplemental brief, and the deadline for doing so has passed.

¶3 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), sufficient evidence supports the jury’s verdict. During an argument with his wife in April 2012, Flores brandished a knife, asked his wife to kill him, and cut himself in front of her and her daughter when she refused. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-2904(A)(6); 13-3601(A). 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); 13-2904(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*

STATE v. FLORES  
Decision of the Court

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