

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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL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

SUSAN ANNE FLECKENSTEIN, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 21-0243 PRPC
FILED 12-23-2021

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County
No. CR1993-090294
The Honorable Jennifer C. Ryan-Touhill, Judge

REVIEW GRANTED AND RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

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

The Nolan Law Firm PLLC, Mesa
By Todd E. Nolan
Counsel for Petitioner

STATE v. FLECKENSTEIN
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Randall M. Howe, Judge Brian Y. Furuya, and Judge Michael J. Brown delivered the decision of the court.

PER CURIAM:

¶1 Petitioner Susan Anne Fleckenstein seeks review of the superior court's order denying her petition for post-conviction relief, filed pursuant to Arizona Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.1. This is petitioner's first 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, the petition for review, and the 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: AA