

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL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

CONRAD ANTHONY TULL, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 18-0574 PRPC
FILED 11-20-18

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County
No. CR 2011-123789-27
The Honorable Sherry K. Stephens, Judge

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Phoenix
By Robert E. Prather
Counsel for Respondent

Law Offices of Harriette P. Levitt, Tucson
By Harriette P. Levitt
Counsel for Petitioner

STATE v. TULL
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Jennifer B. Campbell, Judge Paul J. McMurdie, and Judge Kent E. Cattani delivered the decision of the Court.

PER CURIAM:

¶1 Petitioner Conrad Anthony Tull 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 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, the petition for review, and response. 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: JT