

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

ANNA NOEL CHRISTIANSEN,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0453
Filed May 7, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR20141206001
The Honorable Richard D. Nichols, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Isabel G. Garcia, Pima County Legal Defender
By Alex D. Heveri, Assistant Legal Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. CHRISTIANSEN
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

ECKERSTROM, Chief Judge:

¶1 Appellant Anna Christiansen was charged with two counts of aggravated assault. Following a jury trial, she was convicted of two counts of the lesser-included offense of disorderly conduct, dangerous offenses. The trial court sentenced her to concurrent, partially mitigated prison terms of 1.75 years with forty-seven days of presentence incarceration credit. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), avowing she has reviewed the record and found no meritorious issue to raise on appeal and asking that we search the record for “error.” In compliance with *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d 89, 97 (App. 1999), counsel has also provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record, [so] this court can satisfy itself that counsel has in fact thoroughly reviewed the record.” Christiansen has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to upholding the jury’s verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), the evidence established that in March 2014, the assistant general manager of a Tucson hotel had deactivated the key to the room registered to Christiansen and informed her she would be charged a \$250 fine because hotel staff had reported “a weird odor of smoke” coming from her room in violation of the hotel’s no-smoking policy. Christiansen became “kind of hostile,” used “vulgar language,” and waved a pink and silver semiautomatic “hand pistol”¹ at the assistant manager and

¹Christiansen denied displaying a weapon and none was found.

STATE v. CHRISTIANSEN
Decision of the Court

another hotel employee while saying, “[Y]ou don’t know who you’re messing with, I can’t wait to see you outside of work.” We conclude substantial evidence supported finding the elements necessary for Christiansen’s convictions, *see* A.R.S. § 13-2904(A)(6), and the sentences are lawful and were imposed in a lawful manner, *see* A.R.S. § 13-704(A).

¶3 Our examination of the record pursuant to *Anders* has revealed no reversible error or arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *see also State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575, 694 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1985) (*Anders* requires court to search record for fundamental error). Accordingly, we affirm Christiansen’s convictions and sentences.