

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL  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

ZANE SCOTT DICKINSON, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 15-0703 PRPC  
FILED 10-5-2017

---

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Mohave County  
No. CR2011-00757  
The Honorable Steven F. Conn, Judge, Retired

**REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED**

---

COUNSEL

Mohave County Attorney's Office, Kingman  
By Matthew J. Smith  
*Counsel for Respondent*

Zane Scott Dickinson, Tucson  
*Petitioner*

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Judge Jennifer B. Campbell delivered the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Michael J. Brown and Judge Margaret H. Downie joined.

---

**C A M P B E L L**, Judge:

¶1 Zane Scott Dickinson petitions for review of the summary dismissal of his second notice of post-conviction relief. We have considered the petition for review and grant review, but deny relief.

¶2 A jury convicted Dickinson of attempted second degree murder, two counts of aggravated assault, and leaving the scene of an accident involving death or injury. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent and consecutive prison terms totaling fourteen years. This court affirmed the convictions and sentences on appeal. *State v. Dickinson*, 1 CA-CR 12-0479 (Ariz. App. Dec. 17, 2013) (mem. decision).

¶3 Dickinson filed a timely notice of post-conviction relief pursuant to Rule 32, Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32, and appointed counsel filed a petition for post-conviction relief alleging claims of ineffective assistance of trial counsel. Ruling that Dickinson failed to state a colorable claim for relief, the trial court summarily dismissed the petition.

¶4 Dickinson thereafter filed a second notice of post-conviction relief, indicating his intent to raise a claim of ineffective assistance by his first Rule 32 counsel. Ruling that a claim of ineffective assistance of Rule 32 counsel by a non-pleading defendant is not cognizable under Arizona law, see *State v. Escareno-Meraz*, 232 Ariz. 586, 587, ¶ 4 (App. 2013), the trial court summarily dismissed the notice. This petition for review followed.

¶5 In summarily dismissing the notice, the trial court issued a ruling that clearly identified, fully addressed, and correctly resolved the claim raised by Dickinson. Further, the trial 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 (App. 1993). We therefore adopt the trial court's ruling.

STATE v. DICKINSON  
Decision of the Court

¶6

Accordingly, we grant review, but deny relief.



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