

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

EDWARD MICHAEL GOMEZ,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2018-0176
Filed January 16, 2020

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. 31.19(e).

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. CR20162803001
The Honorable Michael Butler, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Joel Feinman, Pima County Public Defender
By Sarah L. Mayhew, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. GOMEZ
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Staring authored the decision of the Court, in which Chief Judge Vásquez and Judge Brearcliffe concurred.

S T A R I N G, Presiding Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Edward Gomez was convicted of aggravated assault of a police officer and sentenced to a 2.25-year prison term. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530 (App. 1999), stating she has reviewed the record but found no “meritorious issue to raise on appeal” and asking this court to review the record for error. Gomez has filed a supplemental brief raising numerous claims, including that the trial court denied his right to a complete defense by improperly “curtailing testimony,” that his arrest was unlawful and involved excessive force, and that arresting officers “did not act in good faith” in failing to record his arrest with body cameras or a “back seat” camera.

¶2 Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the jury’s verdict, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2 (App. 1999), the evidence is sufficient here, *see A.R.S. § 13-1204(A)(8)(a)*. In June 2016, Gomez kicked a police officer in the face while officers attempted to restrain him after he began kicking the windows of a police vehicle in which he was seated following his arrest.

¶3 Sufficient evidence also supports the trial court’s finding that Gomez had one historical prior felony conviction. His sentence is within the statutory range. A.R.S. §§ 13-703(B), (I), 13-1204(F). We have reviewed the issues Gomez identifies in his supplemental brief and have determined they are not arguable issues requiring further briefing. *See State v. Thompson*, 229 Ariz. 43, ¶ 3 (App. 2012).

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for reversible error, including the purported errors Gomez identified in his supplemental brief, and found none. Accordingly, we affirm Gomez’s conviction and sentence.