

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL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

ANDREW ALEXANDER PARRA-SCHATZ, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 19-0205 PRPC
FILED 11-21-2019

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County
No. CR2016-122754-001
The Honorable Joseph P. Mikitish, Judge

REVIEW GRANTED AND RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Phoenix
By Lisa Marie Martin
Counsel for Respondent

Andrew Alexander Parra-Schatz, Eloy
Petitioner

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Randall M. Howe, Judge David D. Weinzwieg, and Judge
David B. Gass delivered the decision of the Court.

STATE v. PARRA-SCHATZ
Decision of the Court

PER CURIAM:

¶1 Petitioner Andrew Alexander Parra-Schatz 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, 538 ¶ 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