

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Respondent,

v.

ILLYA DURETTE HADNOT,
Petitioner.

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0142-PR
Filed May 31, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Navajo County
No. S0900CR0020070787
The Honorable John Lamb, Judge

REVIEW DENIED

COUNSEL

Brad Carlyon, Navajo County Attorney
By Galen H. Wilkes, Deputy County Attorney, Holbrook
Counsel for Respondent

Illya Hadnot, Tucson
In Propria Persona

STATE v. HADNOT
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

ECKERSTROM, Chief Judge:

¶1 Illya Hadnot 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, Hadnot was convicted of third-degree burglary, disorderly conduct, and attempted armed robbery. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent prison terms, the longest of which was 11.25 years. This court affirmed his convictions and sentences on appeal. *State v. Hadnot*, No. 1 CA-CR 09-0696 (memorandum decision filed Feb. 10, 2011). Hadnot sought post-conviction relief, asserting his trial counsel had been ineffective by failing to adequately prepare for trial, object to the introduction of certain evidence, and “raise obvious impeachment evidence.” The trial court summarily denied relief. This petition for review followed.

¶3 On review, Hadnot merely asserts, without explanation, that his trial counsel did not adequately investigate his case or “bring to [the] court[']s attention vital points and evidence.” He has not provided any citation to the record, and he makes no argument relevant to our consideration of the trial court’s order denying relief. His failure to meaningfully comply with Rule 32.9 justifies our summary refusal to grant 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. Stefanovich*, 232 Ariz. 154, ¶ 16, 302 P.3d 679, 683 (App. 2013) (insufficient argument waives claim on

STATE v. HADNOT
Decision of the Court

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).

¶4 We deny review.