

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

CHARLES SEBASTIAN CUADRAS,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2020-0207  
Filed July 2, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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. CR20091362001  
The Honorable Kimberly H. Ortiz, Judge Pro Tempore

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

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

STATE v. CUADRAS  
Decision of the Court

---

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

---

STARING, Vice Chief Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Charles Cuadras was convicted of aggravated driving under the influence while his license was suspended and sentenced to an eight-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 he has reviewed the record but found no “arguably meritorious issue to raise on appeal” and asking this court to review the record for error. Cuadras has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶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. §§ 28-1381(A)(1), 28-1383(A)(1). In April 2008, a sheriff’s deputy stopped Cuadras after he ran a red light. Cuadras, whose driver license had been suspended, admitted he was “tipsy” and exhibited numerous cues of impairment during a walk-and-turn test, one-legged-stand test, and HGN test.

¶3 Sufficient evidence supports the trial court’s finding that Cuadras had at least two previous felony convictions. His sentence is within the statutory range. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-703(C), (J), 28-1383(O)(1).

¶4 We have searched the record for reversible error and found none. Accordingly, we affirm Cuadras’s conviction and sentence.