

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Respondent,

v.

ANGEL DANIEL GONZALEZ,
Petitioner.

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0117-PR
Filed May 26, 2016

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.
NOT FOR PUBLICATION
See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Mohave County
No. CR20081208
The Honorable Rick A. Williams, Judge

REVIEW DENIED

Angel Gonzalez, Tucson
In Propria Persona

STATE v. GONZALEZ
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Staring authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Howard and Judge Espinosa concurred.

STARING, Judge:

¶1 Angel Gonzalez seeks review of the trial court's order summarily dismissing his petition for post-conviction relief filed pursuant to Rule 32, Ariz. R. Crim. P. For the reasons stated, we deny review.

¶2 After a jury trial, Gonzalez was convicted of possession of a dangerous drug and possession of drug paraphernalia. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent prison terms, the longer of which was eight years. We affirmed his convictions and sentences on appeal. *State v. Gonzalez*, No. 1 CA-CR 11-0072 (memorandum decision filed Mar. 22, 2012). Gonzalez then sought post-conviction relief, and appointed counsel filed a notice stating he had reviewed the record but found no claims to raise in Rule 32 proceedings.

¶3 Gonzalez filed a pro se petition arguing: (1) his trial counsel had been ineffective in failing to effectively address evidence related to methamphetamine, challenge his indictment, or interview certain witnesses; (2) there was insufficient evidence to support his convictions; and (3) the trial court permitted improper testimony. He also asserted appellate counsel was ineffective for failing to raise various arguments. The trial court summarily dismissed the proceeding. This petition for review followed the denial of Gonzalez's subsequent motion for rehearing.

¶4 In his petition for review, Gonzalez again asserts his trial and appellate counsel were ineffective. However, he merely summarizes his claim without providing any citation to legal authority or the record. Nor does he make any argument relevant to our consideration of the trial court's order denying relief. We

STATE v. GONZALEZ
Decision of the Court

therefore deny review. *See* Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(c)(1) (petition for review must comply with rule governing form of appellate motions and contain “reasons why the petition should be granted” and either an appendix or “specific references to the record”); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(f) (appellate review under Rule 32.9 discretionary); *see also State v. Stefanovich*, 232 Ariz. 154, ¶ 16, 302 P.3d 679, 683 (App. 2013) (insufficient argument waives claim on review); *State v. French*, 198 Ariz. 119, ¶ 9, 7 P.3d 128, 131 (App. 2000) (summarily rejecting claims not complying with rules governing form and content of petitions for review), *disapproved on other grounds by Stewart v. Smith*, 202 Ariz. 446, ¶ 10, 46 P.3d 1067, 1071 (2002).

¶5 We deny review.