

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

RICHARD MANUEL CAZARES,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0076
Filed February 18, 2016

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR20142561001
The Honorable Kenneth Lee, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Steven R. Sonenberg, Pima County Public Defender
By Abigail Jensen, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. CAZARES
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, Richard Cazares was convicted of first-degree criminal trespass and four counts of assault. The trial court sentenced him to a three-year prison term for criminal trespass, with time served on his assault convictions. 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. Cazares has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the jury’s verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), sufficient evidence supports them here. In June 2014, Cazares kicked open the door of an apartment and threatened its four occupants while brandishing a knife. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-1203(A)(2); 13-1504(A)(1). And sufficient evidence supported the trial court’s conclusion that Cazares had at least two historical prior felony convictions. His sentence was within the statutory range and properly imposed. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-703(C), (J); 13-1504(B).

¶3 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). We affirm Cazares’s convictions and sentences.