

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL  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

GUILLERMO ARMINDO MARTINEZ, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 15-0279 PRPC  
FILED 2-23-2017

---

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County  
No. CR2012-140856-001  
The Honorable Margaret R. Mahoney, Judge

**REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED**

---

COUNSEL

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

Guillermo Armino Martinez, Florence  
*Petitioner*

STATE v. MARTINEZ  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Judge Jon W. Thompson delivered the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Randall M. Howe and Judge Lawrence F. Winthrop joined.

---

**T H O M P S O N**, Judge:

¶1 Guillermo Armino Martinez petitions for review from the summary dismissal of his petition for post-conviction relief. We have considered the petition for review and, for the reasons stated, grant review and deny relief.

¶2 Martinez pleaded guilty to one count of molestation of a child, a class 2 felony and dangerous crime against children, and two counts of attempted molestation of a child, a class 3 felony and dangerous crime against children. The trial court sentenced him in accordance with the plea agreement to a minimum ten-year prison term on the conviction for molestation of a child and placed him on lifetime probation on the two counts of attempted molestation of a child.

¶3 Martinez filed a timely notice of post-conviction relief. After appointed counsel notified the trial court that counsel was unable to discern any colorable claims for relief, Martinez filed a pro se petition for post-conviction relief, alleging claims of defective indictment creating lack of jurisdiction and ineffective assistance of counsel. Ruling that Martinez failed to present a colorable claim for relief, the trial court dismissed the petition.

¶4 In summarily dismissing the petition, the trial court issued a ruling that clearly identified, fully addressed, and correctly resolved the claims raised by Martinez. 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, "[n]o useful purpose would be served by this court rehashing the trial court's correct ruling in a written decision." *State v. Whipple*, 177 Ariz. 272, 274, 866 P.2d 1358, 1360 (App. 1993). We therefore adopt the trial court's ruling.

STATE v. MARTINEZ  
Decision of the Court

¶5

Accordingly, we grant review but deny relief.



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