

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

REBECCA SAUCEDO,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2013-0433
Filed July 10, 2014

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. CR20124172001
The Honorable Kenneth Lee, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Lori J. Lefferts, Pima County Public Defender
By Frank P. Leto, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. SAUCEDO
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Miller authored the decision of the Court, in which Chief Judge Eckerstrom and Judge Espinosa concurred.

M I L L E R, Presiding Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Rebecca Saucedo was convicted of possession of a narcotic drug (cocaine) and possession of drug paraphernalia. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed Saucedo on concurrent, eighteen-month terms of probation for each count. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), asserting he has reviewed the record but found no arguable issue to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, he has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record” and asks this court to search the record for error. Saucedo has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), we find it sufficient to support the convictions. As a police officer approached her, Saucedo discarded a crumpled piece of paper containing cocaine. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-3401(5), (20)(z); 13-3408(A)(1); 13-3415. And we find no error in the trial court’s imposition of probation. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-603(B), 13-901.01(A).

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and found none. *See State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575, 694 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1985) (stating *Anders* requires court to search record for fundamental error). Accordingly, Saucedo’s convictions and terms of probation are affirmed.