

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

LEROY CALDERON JR.,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2019-0127  
Filed November 5, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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. CR20180879001  
The Honorable James E. Marner, Judge

**AFFIRMED AS CORRECTED**

---

COUNSEL

Joel Feinman, Pima County Public Defender  
By Abigail Jensen, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. CALDERON  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Judge Espinosa authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Eppich and Judge Eckerstrom concurred.

---

ESPINOSA, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Leroy Calderon Jr. was convicted of first-degree murder, kidnapping, aggravated assault, child abuse, and endangerment, all domestic violence offenses. He was also convicted of possession of a deadly weapon by a prohibited possessor. The trial court sentenced Calderon to concurrent and consecutive prison terms, the longest of which was a term of natural life on the murder conviction. Counsel has filed a brief citing *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530 (App. 1999), stating she “has reviewed the entire record and has been unable to find any arguably meritorious issue to raise on appeal.” Counsel has asked us to search the record for error. Calderon has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, see *State v. Delgado*, 232 Ariz. 182, ¶ 2 (App. 2013), the evidence was sufficient to support the jury’s finding of guilt, see A.R.S. §§ 13-1105(A), 13-1201(A), 13-1204(A)(2), 13-1304(A), 13-3101(A)(7), 13-3102(A)(4), 13-3601(A), 13-3623(A)(1). The evidence presented at trial showed that in February 2018, while Calderon’s wife, R.C. was driving on the freeway with Calderon and her seven-year-old son, who lived with the two, Calderon, who had previously been convicted of a felony, was arguing with her and grabbed the wheel, forcing the car into the median. He fired a gun out the rear window and fired again into the floorboards, then shot R.C., got out of the car, came around to the driver’s side of the car, where R.C. fell out of the car door and he shot her again in the back of the head. A knife with blood on it was also found in the car, and R.C. had sharp-instrument wounds on her arm, hand, neck, and right breast.

¶3 We further conclude the sentences imposed are within the statutory limit but correct the term imposed on the kidnapping conviction.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The trial court’s minute entry states that the court imposed a ten-year, presumptive sentence for the kidnapping count. But the

STATE v. CALDERON  
Decision of the Court

See A.R.S. §§ 13-702(D), 13-704(A), 13-705(D), 13-752(A), 13-1105(D), 13-1201(B), 13-1204(E), 13-1304(B), 13-3601(M), 13-3623(A)(1).

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Accordingly, Calderon's convictions and sentences are affirmed as corrected.

---

presumptive term for that count is 10.5 years, and the transcript of the sentencing hearing shows the court imposed that term. The minute entry is therefore ordered corrected to reflect a 10.5-year term. See *State v. Veloz*, 236 Ariz. 532, ¶ 21 (App. 2015) ("We may order the minute entry corrected if the record clearly identifies the intended sentence.").