

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

---

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,  
*Respondent,*

*v.*

STEPHEN BRUNO GALEAZZI,  
*Petitioner.*

No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0244-PR  
Filed August 10, 2015

---

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Maricopa County

No. CR2012101217001DT

The Honorable Pamela D. Svoboda, Judge

**REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED**

---

COUNSEL

William G. Montgomery, Maricopa County Attorney  
By Susan L. Luder, Deputy County Attorney, Phoenix  
*Counsel for Respondent*

Stephen Galeazzi, Kingman  
*In Propria Persona*

STATE v. GALEAZZI  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

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

---

E C K E R S T R O M, Chief Judge:

¶1 Stephen Galeazzi seeks review of the trial court's order summarily denying his petition for post-conviction relief filed pursuant to Rule 32, Ariz. R. Crim. P. We will not disturb that ruling unless the court abused its discretion. *See State v. Swoopes*, 216 Ariz. 390, ¶ 4, 166 P.3d 945, 948 (App. 2007). Galeazzi has not met his burden of demonstrating such abuse here.

¶2 Galeazzi pled guilty to aggravated assault and discharging a firearm at an occupied structure. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent prison terms, the longer of which was eighteen years. He filed a notice of post-conviction relief, and appointed counsel filed a notice stating he had reviewed the record but found no "claims for relief to raise in post-conviction relief proceedings."

¶3 Galeazzi then filed a pro se petition claiming his trial counsel had been ineffective by encouraging him to accept the plea, informing him he would receive only a seven- to ten-year prison term, and failing to request a mitigation hearing to raise Galeazzi's mental health issues. He further claimed his plea was involuntary because of medication he was taking to address his mental health issues. The trial court summarily denied relief, concluding Galeazzi had not demonstrated counsel fell below prevailing professional norms in advising him to plead guilty in light of the strength of the state's case and the numerous charges against him. It also noted that, even if counsel gave Galeazzi incorrect advice about the possible prison term, the court had nonetheless correctly advised Galeazzi during the plea colloquy. The court further concluded that counsel had presented sufficient information about Galeazzi's

STATE v. GALEAZZI  
Decision of the Court

mental health issues and that Galeazzi had not sufficiently supported his claim that his plea was involuntary. This petition for review followed.

¶4 On review, Galeazzi restates the claims made below, argues for the first time that he should have been advised about potential aggravating factors, and suggests that the trial court, the prosecutor, and his counsel had a conflict of interest. As to the claims Galeazzi raised below, we have reviewed the record and conclude the court clearly identified and correctly rejected them in its minute entry, which we accordingly adopt. *See State v. Whipple*, 177 Ariz. 272, 274, 866 P.2d 1358, 1360 (App. 1993) (when trial court has correctly ruled on issues raised “in a fashion that will allow any court in the future to understand the resolution[, n]o useful purpose would be served by this court rehashing the trial court’s correct ruling in a written decision”). As to Galeazzi’s new claims, we do not address claims raised for the first time on review. *See State v. Ramirez*, 126 Ariz. 464, 468, 616 P.2d 924, 928 (App. 1980); *see also* Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(c)(1)(ii) (petition for review should contain “issues which were decided by the trial court and which the defendant wishes to present to the appellate court for review”).

¶5 Although we grant review, we deny relief.