

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Respondent,

v.

IBRM GREAGOR,
Petitioner.

No. 2 CA-CR 2016-0180-PR
Filed June 2, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 Maricopa County
Nos. CR2012147057001SE and CR2011157511001SE
The Honorable Robert L. Gottsfield, Judge

REVIEW DENIED

Ibrm Greagor, Buckeye
In Propria Persona

STATE v. GREAGOR
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 Petitioner Ibrm Greagor seeks review of the trial court's order denying his petition for post-conviction relief, filed pursuant to Rule 32, Ariz. R. Crim. P. Because Greagor has not complied with Rule 32.9(c)(1), we deny review.

¶2 Pursuant to a plea agreement, Greagor was convicted of aggravated assault, a domestic-violence offense in CR 2012-147057. The trial court imposed a five-year term of imprisonment. Greagor also pled guilty to one count of kidnapping in CR 2011-157511. The court suspended the imposition of sentence in that cause and ordered Greagor placed on a four-year term of probation upon his release from prison.

¶3 Greagor thereafter sought post-conviction relief, arguing in his petition that his guilty pleas had not been voluntary and that he had received ineffective assistance of counsel. The trial court summarily denied relief.

¶4 On review, Greagor has filed in this court a copy of his petition for post-conviction relief as his petition for review, and he does not address the trial court's conclusion that his guilty plea was voluntary and counsel's performance was reasonable in light of existing law relating to forfeiture by wrongdoing. *See State v. King*, 212 Ariz. 372, n.5, 132 P.3d 311, 319 n.5 (App. 2006) ("[C]ourts recognize a forfeiture-by-wrongdoing analysis by which a trial court may find that a defendant has forfeited his right of confrontation if the State establishes that the defendant procured or induced the unavailability of the witness."). Greagor's petition therefore does not comply in any meaningful way with Rule 32.9(c)(1).

STATE v. GREAGOR
Decision of the Court

¶5 We deny review.