

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Appellee,*

*v.*

STEPHEN SHERWOOD ALLEN,  
*Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0223  
Filed January 6, 2015

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. 31.24.*

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County  
No. CR20131985001  
The Honorable Scott Rash, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

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

STATE v. ALLEN  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

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

---

ESPINOSA, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Stephen Allen was convicted of eight counts of second-degree trafficking in stolen property, committed while he was on probation for a felony offense. The trial court sentenced him to enhanced, presumptive, 6.5-year prison terms to be served concurrently.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), avowing he has reviewed the record and has found no meritorious 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 he asks this court to search the record for error. Allen has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 We conclude substantial evidence supported the jury’s verdicts. See A.R.S. § 13-2307(A). In sum, on various dates in March and April 2013, Allen pawned property that had been stolen from his roommates. See *State v. Johnson*, 165 Ariz. 555, 556, 799 P.2d 896, 897 (App. 1990) (trafficking in stolen property includes pawning stolen property). We further conclude Allen’s sentences are authorized by statute and were imposed in a lawful manner. See A.R.S. § 13-703(B)(1).

¶4 In our examination of the record, we have found no error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, Allen’s convictions and sentences are affirmed.