

which he received a term of life imprisonment without the possibility of release for twenty-five years.¹ Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297, 451 P.2d 878 (1969), stating he has thoroughly reviewed the record and has found no meritorious issues to raise on appeal. Counsel has asked us to search the record for fundamental error. Hernandez has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdicts, we find there was sufficient evidence to support each of the jury’s findings of guilt. *See State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999). In addition, the sentences are well within the lawful statutory limits.

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Therefore, we affirm Hernandez’s convictions and sentences.

PETER J. ECKERSTROM, Presiding Judge

CONCURRING:

J. WILLIAM BRAMMER, JR., Judge

GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Judge

¹We note two errors in the sentencing minute entry, neither of which affects the sentences imposed and neither of which is reflected in the oral imposition of sentence. On page twelve of the minute entry ruling, the court ordered “Counts Twenty[-]Five through Twenty-Nine . . . to run concurrently.” However, because the jury found Hernandez not guilty of count twenty-six, the inclusion of that count is incorrect. In addition, the ruling mistakenly refers twice to count sixteen.