

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL  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

ERIC LARSON BRINKERHOFF, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 16-0634 PRPC  
FILED 1-16-2018

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County  
No. CR2003-036900-001  
The Honorable Hugh E. Hegyi, Judge

**REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED**

---

COUNSEL

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

Eric Larson Brinkerhoff, Florence  
*Petitioner*

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Presiding Judge Michael J. Brown, Judge Jennifer B. Campbell and Chief  
Judge Samuel A. Thumma delivered the decision of the Court.

---

STATE v. BRINKERHOFF  
Decision of the Court

PER CURIAM:

¶1 Petitioner Eric Brinkerhoff 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 third 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, 577, ¶ 19 (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 (App. 2011) (petitioner has burden of establishing abuse of discretion on review).

¶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 For the foregoing reasons, we grant review and deny relief.



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