

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

TASHA ELIZABETH HERNANDEZ,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0395
Filed May 22, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR20134652001
The Honorable Deborah Bernini, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Lori J. Lefferts, Pima County Public Defender
By Abigail Jensen, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. HERNANDEZ
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 Following a jury trial, appellant Tasha Hernandez was convicted of forgery and theft. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed her on concurrent, three-year terms of probation, ordering her incarcerated for ninety days as a condition of probation. 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), stating she has reviewed the record and has found no “arguably meritorious issue to raise on appeal.” Counsel has asked us to search the record for fundamental error. Hernandez has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, the evidence was sufficient to support the jury’s finding of guilt. See *State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999). The evidence presented at trial showed Hernandez had been helping a vision-impaired woman move and write a check to pay a bill at the time when a second check for \$1,500 was written to Hernandez from the victim’s checking account without her consent or signature, and Hernandez cashed it. We further conclude the terms of probation are within the statutory limit.¹ A.R.S. §§ 13-902(A)(3),(4); 13-1802(a)(1); 13-2002(A)(3).

¹We note that the trial court indicated in its minute entry that Hernandez had been found guilty of “theft from vulnerable adult,” but the transcript reflects the court properly sentenced Hernandez for a theft conviction. The minute entry is hereby ordered corrected to reflect a conviction for theft pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-1802(a)(1).

STATE v. HERNANDEZ
Decision of the Court

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Therefore, Hernandez's convictions and terms of probation are affirmed.