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 UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL AND MAY BE CITED ONLY AS AUTHORIZED BY RULE.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

STEPHEN GRANT MERRILL, Petitioner.

No. 1 CA-CR 17-0775 PRPC FILED 5-15-2018

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County No. CR2012-116325-001; CR2012-116840-001 The Honorable M. Scott McCoy, Judge

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Phoenix By Jeffrey R. Duvendack *Counsel for Respondent*

Ballecer & Segal LLP By Natalee E. Segal, Phoenix *Counsel for Petitioner*

STATE v. MERRILL Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Jon W. Thompson, Judge Peter B. Swann, and Judge James P. Beene delivered the decision of the Court.

$\mathbf{P} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{M}:$

¶1 Petitioner Stephen Grant Merrill 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.

¶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 an abuse of discretion.

¶4 Accordingly, we grant review and deny relief.



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