

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

MATTHEW RENE OROZCO,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2022-0035
Filed July 28, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Pinal County
No. S1100CR202100286
The Honorable Patrick K. Gard, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Czop Law Firm PLLC, Higley
By Steven Czop
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. OROZCO
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 After a jury trial, Matthew Orozco was convicted of possession of a dangerous drug (methamphetamine) and possession of drug paraphernalia (baggies). The trial court sentenced him to enhanced, presumptive, concurrent prison terms, the longer of which is 4.5 years.

¶2 On appeal, 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 found “no arguable issues to present.” Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 30, counsel has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case, with citations to the record,” and has asked this court to search the record for error. Orozco has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to affirming the jury’s verdicts, *see State v. Miles*, 211 Ariz. 475, ¶ 2 (App. 2005), the evidence is sufficient here, *see A.R.S. §§ 13-3401(6)(a)(xxxviii), 13-3407(A)(1), 13-3415(A)*. In February 2021, during a search of Orozco incident to his arrest on an unrelated warrant, a Pinal County Sherriff’s deputy found in Orozco’s sock two plastic baggies containing a crystalline substance. The substance was later determined to be methamphetamine.

¶4 The record also supports the trial court’s finding of one historical prior felony conviction. *See A.R.S. § 13-105(22)(b)*. The sentence imposed is within the statutory range. *See A.R.S. §§ 13-703(B), (I), 13-708, 13-3407(B)(1), 13-3415(A)*.

¶5 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, prejudicial error and have found none. *See State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575 (1985). Accordingly, we affirm Orozco’s convictions and sentences.