

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24

FILED BY CLERK

OCT 25 2012

COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	2 CA-CR 2012-0253-PR
	)	DEPARTMENT B
Respondent,	)	
	)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.	)	Not for Publication
	)	Rule 111, Rules of
CHAD LUCAS HARRISON,	)	the Supreme Court
	)	
Petitioner.	)	
_____	)	

PETITION FOR REVIEW FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR20080502

Honorable Jose H. Robles, Judge Pro Tempore

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

Chad L. Harrison

Florence  
In Propria Persona

ESPINOSA, Judge.

¶1 Petitioner Chad Harrison seeks review of the trial court's summary dismissal of most of the claims in his petition for post-conviction relief, filed pursuant to Rule 32, Ariz. R. Crim. P. We grant review and, for the following reasons, we deny relief.

¶2 After a jury trial, Harrison was convicted of one count each of theft of a means of transportation, third-degree burglary, criminal damage, attempted armed robbery, attempted aggravated robbery, theft of a credit card, taking the identity of another, and misdemeanor assault. The jury found the attempted aggravated robbery a dangerous-nature offense, and the trial court found Harrison had two or more historical prior felony convictions. The court sentenced him to enhanced, mitigated terms of imprisonment, some concurrent and some consecutive, totaling fifteen years. On appeal, Harrison argued the evidence was insufficient to support his convictions; we affirmed his convictions and sentences. *See State v. Harrison*, No. 2 CA-CR 2008-0279 (memorandum decision filed Aug. 27, 2009). He then filed a notice of post-conviction relief and, after appointed counsel notified the court that he could find no arguable claims pursuant to Rule 32, Harrison filed a pro se petition alleging numerous claims.

¶3 The trial court granted relief on one of those claims and ordered that Harrison be resentenced on his attempted armed robbery conviction because the jury had not found it a dangerous-nature offense. The court dismissed all other claims in a detailed ruling on their merits. This petition for review followed.

¶4 We review the summary dismissal of Rule 32 claims for an abuse of discretion. *See State v. Bennett*, 213 Ariz. 562, ¶ 17, 146 P.3d 63, 67 (2006). We find none here. On review, Harrison again argues the merits of the claims he raised below. He also maintains the trial court misunderstood his claim that the indictment had been duplicitous, because the court addressed the use of “on or about” in allegations that his offenses had been committed “[o]n or about the 26th day of January, 2008 through the

27th day of January, 2008,” but did not address whether the indictment was duplicitous for alleging his offenses were committed “through” one day and into the next. Harrison’s complaint, however, is of no moment. As the court stated in its ruling, “Each of the counts [of the indictment] does not allege more than a single offense.”

¶5 With respect to all other issues Harrison raises on review, the trial court clearly identified, addressed, and correctly resolved each of them in a manner sufficient to permit this or any other court to conduct a meaningful review. *See State v. Whipple*, 177 Ariz. 272, 274, 866 P.2d 1358, 1360 (App. 1993). Accordingly, no purpose would be served by repeating the court’s analysis here; instead, we adopt it. *See id.*

¶6 We grant review and, because the trial court did not abuse its discretion in summarily dismissing Harrison’s claims, relief is denied.

/s/ Philip G. Espinosa  
PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/ Garye L. Vásquez  
GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Presiding Judge

/s/ Virginia C. Kelly  
VIRGINIA C. KELLY, Judge