## IN THE ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA, *Appellee*,

v.

SHALMARIE ANN TULK, *Appellant*.

No. 2 CA-CR 2020-0054 Filed January 13, 2022

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 No. S0200CR201900012 The Honorable James L. Conlogue, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Robert J. Zohlmann, Tombstone *Counsel for Appellant* 

## STATE v. TULK Decision of the Court

\_\_\_\_\_

## **MEMORANDUM DECISION**

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

ECVEDCEDOM Drosidina Index

## E C K E R S T R O M, Presiding Judge:

- ¶1 After a jury trial, Shalmarie Tulk was found guilty of illegally conducting an enterprise and conspiracy to commit sale or transportation for sale of methamphetamine and money laundering. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed Tulk on concurrent probation terms, the longer of which is seven years.
- ¶2 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 potential legal issues on appeal" and asking this court to review the record for error. Tulk has not filed a supplemental brief.
- Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the jury's verdicts, see State v. Tamplin, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2 (App. 1999), the evidence is sufficient here, see A.R.S. §§ 13-1003(A), 13-2312(B), 13-2317, 13-3407(A). The evidence shows Tulk's participation in a drug smuggling operation, largely grounded in her communication with the investigation's primary target about drug transactions. The probation terms were lawfully imposed. See A.R.S. §§ 13-901(A), 13-902(A)(1), (2), 13-1003(D), 13-3407(B), 13-2312(D).
- ¶4 We have searched the record for reversible error and found none. Accordingly, we affirm Tulk's convictions and the court's disposition.