

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL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

ARTHUR STANLEY JONES, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 15-0781 PRPC
FILED 12-26-2017

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County
No. CR1999-003525
The Honorable Roland J. Steinle III, Retired *Judge Pro Tempore (Retired)*

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

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

Arthur Stanley Jones, Florence
Petitioner

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Kenton D. Jones, Judge Jon W. Thompson, and Judge
Jennifer M. Perkins delivered the decision of the Court.

STATE v. JONES
Decision of the Court

PER CURIAM:

¶1 Petitioner Arthur Jones 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. *See also* Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.3 (directing the trial court to treat a writ of habeas corpus as a petition for post-conviction relief). This is the petitioner's second successive 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, 576-77, ¶ 19 (2012). It is the petitioner's burden to show that the superior court abused its discretion in denying the petition. *See State v. Poblete*, 227 Ariz. 537, 538, ¶ 1 (App. 2011).

¶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 shown any abuse of discretion.

¶4 Accordingly, we grant review and deny relief.