

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

FREDERICK CLARK,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0127  
Filed February 23, 2017

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Pinal County  
No. S1100CR201500411  
The Honorable Joseph R. Georgini, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Flores & Clark, PC, Globe  
By Daisy Flores  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. CLARK  
Decision of the Court

---

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

---

H O W A R D, Presiding Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Frederick Clark was convicted of aggravated assault. The trial court sentenced him to an enhanced, aggravated, 7.5-year prison term.

¶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 question of law 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. Clark has not filed a supplemental pro se brief.

¶3 The evidence, viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining Clark’s conviction, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), was sufficient to support the jury’s verdict. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-1203(A)(1), 13-1204(A)(3). Clark, an inmate at the Arizona Department of Corrections (ADOC), appeared unexpectedly at the office of Captain B.S., an ADOC disciplinary hearing officer. After some discussion, B.S. told Clark to leave, but Clark moved in closer, and B.S. pushed him away. Clark then punched B.S. several times in the face, fracturing his orbital bone and puncturing his eardrum.

¶4 We further conclude Clark’s sentence was authorized by statute and was properly imposed. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-701(9) and (11); 13-703(I). In our examination of the record, we have found no reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate

STATE v. CLARK  
Decision of the Court

review. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *see also Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97. Accordingly, we affirm Clark's conviction and sentence.