

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

CURTIS RICHARD WINFIELD,  
*Appellant.*

Nos. 2 CA-CR 2020-0013 and 2 CA-CR 2020-0015 (Consolidated)  
Filed September 8, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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 Cochise County  
Nos. S0200CR201800144 and S0200CR201800545  
The Honorable James L. Conlogue, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Emily Danies, Tucson  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. WINFIELD  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

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

---

ECKERSTROM, Judge:

¶1 Pursuant to plea agreements in two separate causes, CR 2018-00144 and CR 2018-00545, appellant Curtis Winfield was convicted of possession of drug paraphernalia “used to smoke methamphetamine” and possession or use of methamphetamine. In CR 2018-00144, the trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed him on a two-year period of probation. The court similarly placed him on a concurrent three-year period of probation in CR 2018-00545.

¶2 After the state filed petitions to revoke probation in both cases, the trial court held a contested, consolidated probation violation hearing. The court found Winfield had violated the terms of his probation by using marijuana and methamphetamine, possessing two knives, and associating with people involved in criminal behavior. The court thereafter sentenced Winfield to a one-year prison term on the paraphernalia count and a concurrent 2.5-year prison term on the methamphetamine count.

¶3 This court granted Winfield’s motion to consolidate the appeals in the two proceedings. 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 record” and “[n]o arguable question of law has been found.” Winfield has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶4 The evidence was sufficient to support the trial court’s finding that Winfield had violated the terms of his probation. See *State v. Vaughn*, 217 Ariz. 518, ¶ 14 (App. 2008). The evidence presented at the revocation hearing showed that Winfield had tested positive on urine tests for marijuana and methamphetamine, had been found to have two knives – one very large and the other a “shank” – in his apartment, and had been present with others who possessed or were under the influence of illegal drugs, all things prohibited by the conditions of his probation. We further conclude the sentences imposed are within the statutory limit. See A.R.S. §§ 13-702(D), 13-3407(A)(1), (B)(1), 13-3415(A).

STATE v. WINFIELD  
Decision of the Court

¶5 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Therefore, we affirm the trial court's decision finding that Winfield had violated the terms of his probation and revoking his probation, as well as his resulting sentences.