

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

MARISELA NAVARRO,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2020-0020
Filed June 23, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR201600497001
The Honorable James E. Marner, Judge

AFFIRMED AS CORRECTED

COUNSEL

Joel Feinman, Pima County Public Defender
By David J. Euchner, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. NAVARRO
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

BREARCLIFFE, Judge:

¶1 Marisela Navarro appeals from the sentences on her convictions for one count of fraudulent schemes and artifices and two counts of theft from a vulnerable adult, after this court vacated the original sentences imposed and remanded for a resentencing on those convictions. *State v. Navarro*, No. 2 CA-CR 2017-0161 (Ariz. App. Nov. 21, 2018) (mem. decision). Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating he has reviewed the record and has been “unable to find any arguable legal issues to raise on appeal.” Consistent with *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 30 (App. 1999), counsel has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case, with citations to the record,” and has asked us to search the record for reversible error. Navarro has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 The sentences imposed on remand are consistent with this court’s direction in the previous appeal and are within the statutory limits. See A.R.S. §§ 13-702(A), (D), 13-703(A), (H), 13-2310(A), 13-1802(G). However, in the course of our review, we noticed that the sentencing minute entry indicates that count two, theft, is designated as a “repetitive offense.” This is contrary to this court’s previous decision and the trial court’s oral pronouncement at resentencing. See *Navarro*, No. 2 CA-CR 2017-0161, ¶ 50. We therefore correct the sentencing minute entry to reflect that count two is non-repetitive. 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.”).

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for reversible error and have found none. We therefore affirm Navarro’s sentences, as corrected.