

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL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

RONNIE EARL HALE, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 16-0190 PRPC
FILED 8-24-2017

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County
No. CR2013-447012-001
The Honorable Peter C. Reinstein, Judge

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

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

Ronnie Earl Hale, Florence
Petitioner

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Chief Judge Samuel A. Thumma delivered the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Margaret H. Downie and Judge Kenton D. Jones joined.

STATE v. HALE
Decision of the Court

T H U M M A, Chief Judge:

¶1 Petitioner Ronnie Earl Hale 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 (2017).¹ 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 (2012). Because Hale has shown no such error, this court grants review but denies relief.

¶2 In February 2014, Hale pled guilty to failure to register as a sex offender, a Class 4 felony, and in March 2014, the superior court placed him on lifetime probation. In July 2015, Hale sought permission to file a delayed notice of post-conviction relief and then filed a petition for post-conviction relief, arguing his "sentence" was illegal. *But see State v. Bouchier*, 159 Ariz. 346, 347 (App. 1989) ("Probation is not a 'sentence.'"). The superior court summarily dismissed the petition. This timely petition for review followed, in which Hale repeats the arguments he made in superior court.

¶3 The superior court dismissed the post-conviction relief proceeding in an order that clearly identified and correctly ruled upon the issues raised. The court did so in a thorough, well-reasoned manner that will allow any future court to understand the court's ruling. 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).

¶4 For these reasons, this court grants review but denies relief.



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

¹ Absent material revisions after the relevant dates, statutes and rules cited refer to the current version unless otherwise indicated.