

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

JAMIE PETER JACKSON,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2020-0079  
Filed July 6, 2021

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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. CR20170896001  
The Honorable Michael Butler, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

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

STATE v. JACKSON  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Presiding Judge Espinosa authored the decision of the Court, in which Vice Chief Judge Staring and Judge Eckerstrom concurred.

---

ESPINOSA, Presiding Judge:

¶1 Following a jury trial, appellant Jamie Jackson was convicted of aggravated assault, stalking, and five counts of aggravated harassment; all of the convictions were domestic violence offenses. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent, “mitigated” and “slightly mitigated” prison terms, the longest of which was two years. 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 he has reviewed the record and has found no “arguably meritorious issue to raise on appeal.” Counsel has asked us to search the record for reversible error. Jackson 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 findings of guilt, *see* A.R.S. §§ 13-1204(B), 13-2921(A)(1), 13-2921.01(A)(1), 13-2923(A)(1), 13-3601(A)(6). The evidence presented at trial showed that Jackson, who was in a romantic relationship with the victim, had pinned her to her bed, “put pressure on [her] neck,” and caused her to pass out. The victim obtained an order of protection that was served on Jackson on September 30, 2016, after which he continued to contact her by email, text message, and Facebook message, causing her to fear for her safety. He also sent her cards and a package, some he “personally delivered” to her home, and he came to her residence and did work she had not asked him to do. We further conclude the sentences imposed are within statutory parameters. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-702(D), 13-1204(E), 13-2921.01(C), 13-2923(C).

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Accordingly, Jackson’s convictions and sentences are affirmed.