

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL  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

DANIEL ADEM VAN DAALEN, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 21-0117 PRPC  
FILED 8-31-2021

---

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County  
No. CR2002-019041  
The Honorable Timothy J. Ryan, Judge

**REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED**

---

COUNSEL

Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Phoenix  
By Daniel Strange  
*Counsel for Respondent*

Daniel Adem Van Daalen, Tucson  
*Petitioner*

STATE v. VAN DAALEN  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Presiding Judge Cynthia J. Bailey, Judge Jennifer M. Perkins and Judge Maria Elena Cruz delivered the decision of the Court.

---

**PER CURIAM:**

¶1 Petitioner Daniel Adem Van Daalen seeks review of the superior court's order denying his petition for post-conviction relief. This is petitioner's fourth 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, 278 P.3d 1276, 1280 (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, 260 P.3d 1102, 1103 (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 We grant review and deny relief.



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