

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

DONALD KEITH LUCAS,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2023-0160  
Filed December 19, 2023

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Mohave County  
No. S8015CR202100047  
The Honorable Rick Lambert, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Janelle A. McEachern, Chandler  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. LUCAS  
Decision of the Court

---

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge O’Neil authored the decision of the Court, in which Vice Chief Judge Staring and Judge Sklar concurred.

---

O’NEIL, Judge:

¶1 Appellant Donald Lucas was convicted of criminal damage after a jury trial. He was also convicted of threatening or intimidating and disorderly conduct after a bench trial.<sup>1</sup> The trial court sentenced him to an aggravated prison term of two years for criminal damage and to time served for the other offenses.

¶2 On appeal, counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297 (1969), asserting she “has found no arguable question of law that is not frivolous.” Consistent with *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 30 (App. 1999), 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 reversible error. Lucas has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to affirming the verdicts, see *State v. Holle*, 240 Ariz. 300, ¶ 2 (2016), the evidence is sufficient here, see A.R.S. §§ 13-1202(A)(1), 13-1601, 13-1602(A), 13-1701, 13-2904(A)(1). In August 2020, Lucas spray-painted signs and electrical boxes and damaged landscaping in the neighborhood in which he worked as a caregiver for a resident. In social-media posts made at that time, Lucas identified the homeowners’ association and several neighbors by name and said he was going to damage their properties to decrease the value. When officers responded to investigate, Lucas was “yelling profanities and shouting” and threatened to kill another neighbor. Lucas caused approximately \$4,700 in damage.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lucas was previously convicted of the same offenses, but this court reversed his convictions and sentences on appeal on the state’s confession of trial error. *State v. Lucas*, No. 1 CA-CR 21-0462 (Ariz. App. Oct. 3, 2022) (decision order).

STATE v. LUCAS  
Decision of the Court

¶4 The sentences imposed are within the statutory ranges. See A.R.S. §§ 13-105, 13-702(D), 13-707(A)(1), 13-1202(B), 13-1602(B)(3), 13-2904(B).

¶5 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for reversible error and have found none. See *State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575 (1985). Accordingly, we affirm Lucas's convictions, prison sentence, and jail terms.