

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Respondent,*

*v.*

TERRY LEE PATERAKIS III,  
*Petitioner.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0465-PR  
Filed January 21, 2016

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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.*

---

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County  
No. CR2006048006001DT  
The Honorable J. Richard Gama, Judge

**REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED**

---

Terry Paterakis III, Buckeye  
*In Propria Persona*

STATE v. PATERAKIS  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Judge Staring authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Howard and Judge Espinosa concurred.

---

STARING, Judge:

¶1 Petitioner Terry Paterakis seeks review of the trial court's order denying his petition for post-conviction relief, filed pursuant to Rule 32, Ariz. R. Crim. P. "We will not disturb a trial court's ruling on a petition for post-conviction relief absent a clear abuse of discretion." *State v. Swoopes*, 216 Ariz. 390, ¶ 4, 166 P.3d 945, 948 (App. 2007). Paterakis has not sustained his burden of establishing such abuse here.

¶2 Pursuant to a plea agreement, Paterakis was convicted of three counts of armed robbery. The trial court sentenced him to enhanced, aggravated, and concurrent prison terms, each of which was fifteen years. Paterakis thereafter sought and was denied post-conviction relief three times. This court granted review, but denied relief on one of those proceedings in 2013. *State v. Paterakis*, No. 1 CA-CR 12-0630 PRPC (memorandum decision filed Nov. 7, 2013).

¶3 In April 2014, Paterakis again sought post-conviction relief, arguing his plea had not been "knowing, intelligent and voluntary," his sentence violated the terms of the agreement, he had received ineffective assistance of counsel, his sentence had been improperly aggravated and enhanced, and the prosecutor had committed misconduct. He also asserted preclusion did not apply because he had been told he could appeal. The trial court summarily denied relief, concluding Paterakis's claims were precluded.

¶4 We cannot say the trial court abused its discretion in denying Paterakis's petition for post-conviction relief. The court clearly identified the claims he raised and resolved them correctly in

STATE v. PATERAKIS  
Decision of the Court

a thorough, well-reasoned minute entry, which we adopt. *See State v. Whipple*, 177 Ariz. 272, 274, 866 P.2d 1358, 1360 (App. 1993) (when trial court has correctly ruled on issues raised “in a fashion that will allow any court in the future to understand the resolution[, n]o useful purpose would be served by this court rehashing the trial court’s correct ruling in a written decision”).

¶5 Therefore, although we grant the petition for review, we deny relief.