

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL  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