

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Respondent,*

*v.*

KYRON DALE GROW,  
*Petitioner.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0409-PR  
Filed February 23, 2017

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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 Gila County  
No. S0400CR201300213  
The Honorable Monica L. Stauffer, Judge

**REVIEW DENIED**

---

Kyron Dale Grow, Florence  
*In Propria Persona*

STATE v. GROW  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Judge Vásquez authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Howard and Chief Judge Eckerstrom concurred.

---

VÁSQUEZ, Judge:

¶1 Kyron Grow seeks review of the trial court’s ruling denying his petition for post-conviction relief filed pursuant to Rule 32.1, Ariz. R. Crim. P. For the reasons that follow, we deny review.

¶2 After a jury trial, Grow was convicted of first-degree murder, aggravated assault, and two counts of child abuse likely to cause death or serious physical injury. He was sentenced to concurrent prison terms, the longest of which is a life sentence without the possibility of release for thirty-five years for the murder conviction. We affirmed his convictions and sentences on appeal. *State v. Grow*, No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0277 (Ariz. App. July 14, 2015) (mem. decision).

¶3 Grow sought post-conviction relief, and appointed counsel filed a notice stating she had reviewed the record but found no colorable claims to raise in a post-conviction proceeding. Grow filed a pro se petition, claiming his trial counsel had been ineffective for failing to “call [an] expert[] to rebut[] the state’s expert’s opinion” and for failing to respond to what Grow believed were inconsistencies or weaknesses in the state’s case against him. The trial court summarily denied relief, and this petition for review followed.

¶4 Grow’s petition for review contains no description of the issues decided by the trial court and only a cursory description of the relevant facts. He provides no citations to the record or relevant authority. Instead, he attaches what appear to be handwritten versions of a transcript, a call log, and reports, interspersed with commentary about his case. But he does not

STATE v. GROW  
Decision of the Court

explain how these documents support the arguments he raised below. And he does not explain how the court abused its discretion in rejecting those claims, as required by Rule 32.9(c)(1). Grow's failure to comply with Rule 32.9 justifies our summary refusal to grant review. *See* Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(c)(1) (petition for review must contain "reasons why the petition should be granted" and either appendix or "specific references to the record"), (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.