

NOTICE: NOT FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.  
UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL  
AND MAY BE CITED ONLY AS AUTHORIZED BY RULE.

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

---

STATE OF ARIZONA, *Respondent*,

*v.*

EDGAR HARRISON EDMONDSON, III, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 13-0459 PRPC

FILED 1-29-2015

---

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County

No. CR2009-132461-003

The Honorable Randall H. Warner, Judge

**REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED**

---

COUNSEL

Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Phoenix  
By Diane Meloche  
*Counsel for Respondent*

Edgar Edmondson, III, Douglas  
*Petitioner*

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Judge Lawrence F. Winthrop delivered the decision of the Court, in which  
Presiding Judge Kent E. Cattani and Judge Peter B. Swann joined.

---

STATE v. EDMONDSON  
Decision of the Court

WINTHROP, Judge:

¶1 Petitioner, Edgar Harrison Edmondson, III (“Edmondson”), petitions this court for review from the dismissal of his petition for post-conviction relief. We have considered the petition for review and, for the reasons stated, grant review, but deny relief.

¶2 Edmondson pled guilty to conspiracy to commit possession of dangerous drugs for sale and possession of dangerous drugs. The trial court sentenced him to ten years’ imprisonment for conspiracy to commit possession of dangerous drugs for sale and placed him on a consecutive term of three years’ probation for possession of dangerous drugs. Edmondson now seeks review of the summary dismissal of his third successive post-conviction relief proceeding. We have jurisdiction pursuant to Arizona Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.9(c).

¶3 We deny relief. Rather than identify specific claims for relief supported with fully and independently developed arguments, citation to legal authority, and citations to the record, Edmondson attempts to present issues for review by incorporating by reference the petition for post-conviction relief he filed below. A petition for review may not incorporate by reference any issue or argument. *State v. Bortz*, 169 Ariz. 575, 577, 821 P.2d 236, 238 (App. 1991). Instead, the petition must set forth specific claims, present sufficient argument supported by legal authority, and include citation to the record. *See* Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.5, 32.9(c). “[C]ompliance with Rule 32 is not a mere formality.” *Canion v. Cole*, 210 Ariz. 598, 600, ¶ 11, 115 P.3d 1261, 1263 (2005). A petitioner must “strictly comply” with Rule 32 in order to be entitled to relief. *Id.*

¶4 We grant review, but deny relief.



Ruth A. Willingham · Clerk of the Court  
FILED : ama