

NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P. 65.37

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
	:	PENNSYLVANIA
v.	:	
JERMAINE QUANT'E SHIPMAN,	:	No. 584 WDA 2012
	:	
Appellant	:	

Appeal from the PCRA Order, March 23, 2012,
in the Court of Common Pleas of Cambria County
Criminal Division at No. CP-11-CR-0001564-2007

BEFORE: STEVENS, P.J., FORD ELLIOTT, P.J.E. AND MUNDY, J.

MEMORANDUM BY FORD ELLIOTT, P.J.E.: Filed: February 22, 2013

Appellant comes before us challenging the order denying his petition filed pursuant to the Post Conviction Relief Act ("PCRA"), 42 Pa.C.S.A. §§ 9541-9546.¹ Finding no error, we affirm.

On September 1, 2010, appellant pleaded guilty to criminal trespass, loitering and prowling at nighttime, and harassment. The charges stemmed from an incident on May 23, 2007 in which appellant broke into the residence of a female former acquaintance, ransacked her belongings, urinated on the carpet, and placed a used condom in her bed. Immediately

¹ This was not appellant's first PCRA petition. Appellant had previously had a guilty plea and sentence in this case set aside by a prior PCRA petition, and also filed other PCRA petitions prior to the present.

following the plea, the court imposed the negotiated sentence of two to five years' imprisonment.

Appellant filed the instant PCRA petition *pro se* on May 6, 2011. An amended, counseled petition was subsequently filed and evidentiary hearings were conducted over four days in August and October of 2011. As noted the petition was subsequently denied.

On appeal, appellant raises three issues:

1. The Trial Court erred in finding that the Appellant was not denied effective counsel as a result of the plea for which he contends was not entered in a knowing and competent manner.
2. The Trial Court erred in failing to grant the Appellant's Motion to Recuse the entire Cambria County Bench.
3. The Trial Court erred in failing to grant the Appellant's request for credit for time served.

Appellant's brief at 3.

We find no error with the PCRA court's ruling. After a thorough review of the record, the briefs of the parties, the applicable law, and the well-reasoned opinion of the PCRA court, it is our determination that there is no merit to the questions raised on appeal. The PCRA court's meticulous, 11-page opinion, filed on March 23, 2012, comprehensively discusses and properly disposes of the questions presented. We will adopt it as our own and affirm on that basis.

Order affirmed.