ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT

No. CR 07-149

Opinion Delivered

March 1, 2007

JOE JONES
Petitioner

PRO SE PETITION FOR REVIEW [CACR 06-673] [CIRCUIT COURT OF PULASKI COUNTY, CR 2005-4059,

HON. JOHN LANGSTON, JUDGE

v.

PETITION DENIED.

STATE OF ARKANSAS
Respondent

PER CURIAM

Petitioner Joe Jones was found guilty by a jury of commercial burglary and misdemeanor theft of property and sentenced as a habitual offender to 180 months' imprisonment. The Arkansas Court of Appeals affirmed. *Jones v. State*, CACR 06-673 (Ark. App. January 31, 2007).

Now before us is petitioner's *pro se* petition for review, asking that this court review the brief prepared by his attorney on appeal and the opinion issued by the court of appeals. He states that he intends to submit a *pro se* brief in support of the petition at a later date.

We first note that petitioner was represented by counsel in the appeal to the court of appeals. He has not demonstrated that there is some good cause to permit him to enjoy representation by counsel and to also file *pro se* pleadings. It is well settled that having accepted representation by counsel, an appellant is not entitled to pursue his own motions for relief and also rely on counsel to represent him. *See Monts v. Lessenberry*, 305 Ark. 202, 806 S.W.2d 379 (1991) (*per curiam*). With respect to petitioner's statement that he intends to file a *pro se* brief later, he has not shown that he

is entitled to submit a *pro se* petition for review and thus has not established that he is entitled to submit a *pro se* brief.

Moreover, even if this court were to consider the *pro se* petition for review, there is no ground stated in it pursuant to Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 2-4(c) to grant a review. The rule provides that review will not be granted without a showing by the petitioner that the decision of the court of appeals is in conflict with a prior holding of a published opinion of either this court or the court of appeals or that the court otherwise erred with respect to one of the grounds enumerated in Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 1-2(b). The mere request that this court review the briefs filed in the court of appeals and the opinion of that court does not demonstrate a basis for relief under the rule.

Petition denied.