



STATE OF ARIZONA v. KENNETH KAYSHAWN BOYD, JR.

2023 | Cited 0 times | Court of Appeals of Arizona | February 27, 2023

IN THE ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA, Appellee,

v.

KENNETH KAYSHAWN BOYD JR., Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2022-0074 Filed February 27, 2023

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 NOT FOR PUBLICATION See Ariz.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. 31.19(e).

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County No. CR20191936001 The Honorable Scott McDonald, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Emily Danies, Tucson Counsel for Appellant MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Sklar authored the decision of the Court, in which Vice Chief Judge Staring and Judge concurred.

S K L A R, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, Kenneth Boyd Jr. was convicted of second-degree murder, armed robbery, and attempted theft of a means of transportation. The trial court sentenced him to a combination of concurrent and consecutive, slightly mitigated prison terms totaling sixteen years.

¶2 On appeal, counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530 (App. 1999), stating she has reviewed the record and has found no arguable issues to raise. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 30, counsel has provided detailed



STATE OF ARIZONA v. KENNETH KAYSHAWN BOYD, JR.

2023 | Cited 0 times | Court of Appeals of Arizona | February 27, 2023

factual and procedural history of the case, with citations to the

record, has asked this court to search the record for reversible error. Boyd has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to verdicts, see *State v. Miles*, 211 Ariz. 475, ¶ 2 (App. 2005), the evidence is

sufficient here, see A.R.S. §§ 13-105(10)(a), (12), 13-1001(A), 13-1104(A)(1), 13-1814(A), 13-1904(A)(2). In April 2019, Boyd attacked eighty-year-old M.M. with a log, killing him after hitting him several times in the head. Boyd took M.M. wallet with \$92 in cash and credit cards, and he attempted to use but could not start it. The sentences imposed are within the statutory ranges. See A.R.S. §§ 13-702(D), 13-704(A), 13-710(A), 13-1001(C)(3), 13-1104(C), 13-1814(D), 13-1904(B).

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, prejudicial error and have found none. See *State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575 (1985). Accordingly, we affirm convictions and sentences.

