

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Respondent,*

*v.*

LATONYA CLAYTON,  
*Petitioner.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2024-0135  
Filed December 6, 2024

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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).*

---

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Navajo County  
No. S0900CR202200876  
The Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

The Rigg Law Firm P.L.L.C, Pinetop  
By Brett R. Rigg  
*Counsel for Appellant*

STATE v. CLAYTON  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

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

---

G A R D, Presiding Judge:

¶1 Appellant Latonya Clayton pleaded guilty to attempting to possess narcotic drugs for sale. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed her on a five-year term of probation in July 2023. After a contested probation revocation hearing in May 2024, the court found she had violated the terms of her probation and sentenced her to two years' imprisonment.

¶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), asserting he has reviewed the record and has found no arguable issues to raise. *See also State v. Rodriguez*, 19 Ariz. App. 120, 120 (1973) (applying *Anders* procedure to probation revocation proceedings). Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 30, counsel has provided a factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record and has asked this court to search the record for reversible error. Clayton has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 The evidence, viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the trial court's finding of a probation violation, was sufficient to support that finding. *See State v. Vaughn*, 217 Ariz. 518, n.2 (App. 2008). In February 2024, Clayton was at a court-ordered treatment facility, was found to be in possession of a cell phone, headphones, and a charging cable in violation of facility rules, and was discharged unsuccessfully from the treatment program. The sentence imposed is within the statutory range. *See A.R.S. §§ 13-702(D), 13-1001(C)(2), 13-3408(A)(2), (B)(2)*.

¶4 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 the trial court's finding that Clayton violated the terms of her probation and the sentence imposed.