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 UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL AND MAY BE CITED ONLY AS AUTHORIZED BY RULE.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

RUBEN NINO, Petitioner.

No. 1 CA-CR 15-0740 PRPC FILED 12-7-2017

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County Nos. CR2009-145479-002; CR2009-167083-001 The Honorable Keelan J. Bodow, Judge *Pro Tempore*

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Yavapai County No. P1300CR2009-10212 The Honorable Thomas B. Lindberg, Judge (Retired)

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

APPEARANCES

Ruben Nino, Douglas *Petitioner*

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

STATE v. NINO Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge James P. Beene, Judge Randall M. Howe and Judge Kent E. Cattani delivered the following decision.

PER CURIAM:

¶1 Petitioner Ruben Nino seeks review of the superior court's order denying his petition for post-conviction relief, filed pursuant to Arizona Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.1. This is Petitioner's second petition.

¶2 Absent an abuse of discretion or error of law, this court will not disturb a superior court's ruling on a petition for post-conviction relief. *State v. Gutierrez*, 229 Ariz. 573, 577, **¶** 19, 278 P.3d 1276, 1280 (2012). It is petitioner's burden to show that the superior court abused its discretion by denying the petition for post-conviction relief. *See State v. Poblete*, 227 Ariz. 537, **¶** 1, 260 P.3d 1102, 1103 (App. 2011) (petitioner has burden of establishing abuse of discretion on review).

 $\P 3$ We have reviewed the record in this matter, the superior court's order denying the petition for post-conviction relief, and the petition for review. We find that petitioner has not established an abuse of discretion.

¶4 We grant review and deny relief.



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