

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

DAWN MARIE SERVANT,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2022-0027  
Filed September 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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 Gila County  
No. S0400CR202000324  
The Honorable Bryan B. Chambers, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Emily Danies, Tucson  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. SERVANT  
Decision of the Court

---

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

---

BREARCLIFFE, Judge:

¶1 Following a jury trial, appellant Dawn Servant was convicted of first-degree hindering prosecution. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed her on an eighteen-month term of probation. 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 she has reviewed the record and has found no “arguable question of law” to raise on appeal. Counsel has asked us to search the record for fundamental error. Servant 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 finding of guilt, see A.R.S. §§ 13-2510, 13-2512(A). The evidence presented at trial showed that when officers arrived at her home looking for a suspect, Servant told them he was not there, despite knowing that he was hiding behind a wall in the home. We further conclude the term of probation is within the statutory limit. See A.R.S. §§ 13-902(A)(4), 13-2512(B).

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Therefore, Servant’s conviction and term of probation are affirmed.