

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

JEROLD WOLFORD,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0365  
Filed June 29, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Pima County  
No. CR20152874002  
The Honorable Paul E. Tang, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Joel Feinman, Pima County Public Defender  
By Michael J. Miller, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. WOLFORD  
Decision of the Court

---

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Vásquez authored the decision of the Court, in which Judge Espinosa and Judge Howard<sup>1</sup> concurred.

---

V Á S Q U E Z, Presiding Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Jerold Wolford was convicted of theft of property with a value greater than \$25,000 and second-degree trafficking in stolen property. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and imposed concurrent, five-year terms of probation for each offense.

¶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 reviewed the record but found no arguably meritorious issue to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, he provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record” and asked this court to search the record for error.

¶3 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 and July 2015, Wolford possessed property with a value of at least \$25,000 that had been stolen from the victims’ home, including coins, vases, watches, and jewelry; Wolford had pawned some items and other stolen property was found in his vehicle. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-1802(A)(1), (5), (G), 13-2307(A). And we find no error in the trial court’s imposition of probation. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-603(B), 13-901.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Hon. Joseph W. Howard, a retired judge of this court, is called back to active duty to serve on this case pursuant to orders of this court and our supreme court.

STATE v. WOLFORD  
Decision of the Court

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and found none. *See State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575, 694 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1985) (stating *Anders* requires court to search record for fundamental error). Accordingly, Wolford's convictions and terms of probation are affirmed.