

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Respondent,

v.

RAMON JUAN ESCARENO-MERAZ,
Petitioner.

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0173-PR
Filed November 12, 2014

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Pima County

No. CR061723

The Honorable Kathleen Quigley, Judge

REVIEW DENIED

COUNSEL

Barbara LaWall, Pima County Attorney
By Jacob R. Lines, Deputy County Attorney, Tucson
Counsel for Respondent

Ramon Juan Escareno-Meraz, Tucson
In Propria Persona

STATE v. ESCARENO-MERAZ
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Miller authored the decision of the Court, in which Chief Judge Eckerstrom and Judge Espinosa concurred.

M I L L E R, Presiding Judge:

¶1 Ramon Escareno-Meraz petitions this court for 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 that follow, we deny review.

¶2 Escareno-Meraz was convicted after a jury trial of various offenses related to his participation in a drug trafficking operation and was sentenced to aggravated prison terms, including three consecutive 18.5-year terms. *State v. Escareno-Meraz*, 232 Ariz. 586, ¶ 2, 307 P.3d 1013, 1013-14 (App. 2013). We affirmed his convictions and sentences on appeal. *State v. Escareno-Meraz*, No. 2 CA-CR 99-0186 (memorandum decision filed Mar. 29, 2001). Before this proceeding, Escareno-Meraz sought post-conviction relief on at least two occasions; the trial court denied relief both times, and this court denied relief on review. *Escareno-Meraz*, 232 Ariz. 586, ¶ 2, 307 P.3d at 1014; *State v. Escareno-Meraz*, No. 2 CA-CR 2002-0450-PR (decision order filed Jul. 30, 2004).

¶3 In his most recent petition for post-conviction relief, Escareno-Meraz claimed that his counsel failed to inform him about a plea offer from the state and that his sentences violated the Eighth Amendment prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment because his codefendants received substantially lesser sentences. The trial court summarily dismissed the petition, concluding his claims were precluded pursuant to Rule 32.2, Ariz. R. Crim. P.

¶4 On review, Escareno-Meraz briefly repeats his claims and asserts he is entitled to relief. However, he does not address in his petition the court's summary dismissal on the grounds of

STATE v. ESCARENO-MERAZ
Decision of the Court

preclusion or advance any basis for concluding that ruling was incorrect or an abuse of discretion. Moreover, his reliance in a supplemental citation to *State v. Sheppard*, 179 Ariz. 83, 876 P.2d 579 (1994), and *State v. Thompson*, 198 Ariz. 142, 7 P.3d 151 (App. 2000), vacated by 200 Ariz. 439, 27 P.3d 796 (2001), is unavailing because neither case concerns preclusion. Because Escareno-Meraz fails to provide any legal argument relevant to our consideration of the court's order, we 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. Bolton*, 182 Ariz. 290, 298, 896 P.2d 830, 838 (1995) (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 Review is denied.