

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Respondent,

v.

MARTIN LEON CORRAL,
Petitioner.

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0016
Filed May 4, 2016

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Pima County
No. CR20081114
The Honorable Howard Fell, Judge Pro Tempore

REVIEW DENIED

COUNSEL

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

Martin Corral, Tucson
In Propria Persona

STATE v. CORRAL
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

M I L L E R, Judge:

¶1 Martin Corral seeks review of the trial court’s ruling denying his petition for post-conviction relief filed pursuant to Rule 32, Ariz. R. Crim. P. We deny review.

¶2 After a jury trial, Corral was convicted of two counts of aggravated assault and one count each of aggravated driving with an illegal drug or its metabolite in his body, criminal damage, and fleeing from a law-enforcement vehicle. The trial court imposed a combination of concurrent and consecutive prison terms totaling 35.5 years. We affirmed his convictions and sentences on appeal. *State v. Corral*, No. 2 CA-CR 2010-0189 (memorandum decision filed Aug. 26, 2011). Corral then sought post-conviction relief, arguing his trial counsel had been ineffective in failing to adequately raise issues related to his competency and there was newly discovered evidence relevant to that issue. The trial court denied relief, and we denied relief on review. *State v. Corral*, No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0289 (memorandum decision filed Nov. 28, 2014).

¶3 In December 2014, Corral filed a notice of post-conviction relief. Appointed counsel filed a notice stating he had reviewed the record but had found no claims to raise; counsel later filed, on Corral’s behalf, a pro se petition for post-conviction relief. In that petition, Corral offered “to take a lie test” to show that his version of events—that he was beaten up after an accident and had not been on his medication—was true. The trial court summarily denied the petition. This petition for review followed.

¶4 On review, Corral discusses issues similar to those addressed in his first Rule 32 proceeding. Those claims were not raised in Corral’s most recent proceeding and are not properly

STATE v. CORRAL
Decision of the Court

before us on review. *See* Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(c)(1)(ii) (petition for review shall contain “[t]he issues which were decided by the trial court . . . which the defendant wishes to present . . . for review”). The time has long passed for Corral to seek review of our memorandum decision upholding the trial court’s decision to reject those claims. *See* Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.18, 31.19, 32.9(g). And Corral does not discuss in his petition for review his most-recent post-conviction proceeding.

¶5 For these reasons, we deny review.