

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL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.

GERMAN FELIPE REYES-REYES, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 15-0236 PRPC
FILED 4-27-2017

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County

No. CR2010-105623-001

No. CR2012-103491-001

The Honorable Robert E. Miles, Judge, *Retired*

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Phoenix

By Gerald R. Grant

Counsel for Respondent

German Felipe Reyes-Reyes, San Luis

Petitioner

STATE v. REYES-REYES
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Randall M. Howe delivered the decision of the Court, in which Judge Peter B. Swann and Chief Judge Michael J. Brown joined.

H O W E, Judge:

¶1 German Felipe Reyes-Reyes petitions this Court for review from the summary dismissal of his amended petition for post-conviction relief. We have considered the petition for review and, for the reasons stated, grant review but deny relief.

¶2 After a jury trial, Reyes-Reyes was convicted of possession of dangerous drugs and misconduct involving weapons in cause number CR2012-103491-001. The trial court sentenced Reyes-Reyes as a repetitive offender to concurrent ten-year prison terms. Based on the convictions, the trial court revoked his probation in cause number CR2010-105623-001 and sentenced him to a consecutive one-year prison term following the sentence in CR2012-103491-001. The convictions, revocation of probation, and sentences were affirmed on appeal. *State v. Reyes-Reyes*, 1 CA-CR 12-0573 and 1 CA-CR 12-0576 (consolidated) (Ariz. App. Jan. 9, 2014) (mem. decision).

¶3 Reyes-Reyes timely commenced a post-conviction relief proceeding. Reyes-Reyes's appointed counsel then notified the trial court that he had reviewed the record and was unable to find a meritorious issue to raise in a Rule 32 proceeding. Reyes-Reyes filed a *pro se* petition in which he raised claims of ineffective assistance of trial and appellate counsel and prosecutorial misconduct. The trial court summarily dismissed the petition, concluding that the claims were conclusory, speculative, and without support in the record.

¶4 On review, Reyes-Reyes again argues the same claims raised below. In summarily dismissing the petition, the trial court issued a ruling that clearly identified, fully addressed, and correctly resolved the claims raised by Reyes-Reyes. Further, the court did so in a thorough, well-reasoned manner that will allow any future court to understand the court's rulings. Under these circumstances, we need not repeat the trial court's analysis here; instead, we adopt it. *See State v. Whipple*, 177 Ariz. 272, 274, 866 P.2d 1358, 1360 (App. 1993) (holding that when the trial court rules

STATE v. REYES-REYES
Decision of the Court

“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 Accordingly, although we grant review, we deny relief.



AMY M. WOOD • Clerk of the Court
FILED: AA