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 UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL AND MAY BE CITED ONLY AS AUTHORIZED BY RULE.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.

MICHAEL RAY FUQUA, Petitioner.

No. 1 CA-CR 21-0260 PRPC FILED 7-26-2022

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Navajo County No. CR2005-0569 The Honorable Michael D. Latham, Judge

#### **REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED**

#### COUNSEL

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

Apfel Law Group, Phoenix By Seth Apfel *Counsel for Petitioner* 

### STATE v. FUQUA Decision of the Court

### MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Brian Y. Furuya, Judge Jennifer B. Campbell, and Judge Paul J. McMurdie delivered the following decision.

## PER CURIAM:

**¶1** Petitioner Michael Ray Fuqua 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 Fuqua'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 the 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).

 $\P 3$  We have reviewed the record in this matter, the superior court's order denying the petition for post-conviction relief, the petition for review, response, and reply. We find the petitioner has not established an abuse of discretion.

**¶4** We grant review but deny relief.



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