

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

GASTON SANTOS LLANES-DELAREY,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0041
Filed June 12, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. CR20140593001
The Honorable Richard D. Nichols, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Steven R. Sonenberg, Pima County Public Defender
By Abigail Jensen, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. LLANES-DELAREY
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 After a jury trial, Gaston Llanes-Delarey was convicted of aggravated robbery. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed Llanes-Delarey on an eighteen-month term 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), asserting she 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, she 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. Llanes-Delarey has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), sufficient evidence supports the jury’s verdict here. In October 2013, Llanes-Delarey pushed and fought with a convenience store clerk while his companion stole a case of beer. A.R.S. §§ 13-1902(A); 13-1903(A). The term of his probation is authorized by statute and was imposed in a lawful manner. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-901(A), (B); 13-902(A)(2); 13-1903(B).

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental error and found none. *See 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 Llanes-Delarey’s conviction and disposition.