IN THE

ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Respondent,

v.

LUIS AULENTI ANGULO,
Petitioner.

No. 2 CA-CR 2026-0182-PR
Filed November 23, 2026

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. 31.19(e).

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Navajo County
No. S0900CR202300813
The Honorable Jon H. Saline, Judge

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

The Rigg Law Firm P.L.L.C., Pinetop
By Brett R. Rigg
Counsel for Petitioner

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Chief Judge Staring authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Vásquez and Vice Chief Judge Eppich concurred.

S T A R I N G, Chief Judge:

¶1 Luis Angulo seeks review of the superior court's order summarily dismissing his petition for post-conviction relief filed under Rule 33, Ariz. R. Crim. P. We will not disturb that ruling unless the court abused its discretion, *State v. Mendoza*, 249 Ariz. 180, ¶ 1 (App. 2020), which Angulo has not established here.

¶2 Angulo pled guilty to possession of a narcotic drug for sale and was sentenced to a four-year prison term. He sought post-conviction relief, arguing his trial counsel had been ineffective in failing to file a motion to suppress evidence. The superior court summarily dismissed the petition, and this petition for review followed.

¶3 On review, Angulo repeats his claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, arguing he is entitled to an evidentiary hearing. But, by pleading guilty, Angulo waived all non-jurisdictional defects and defenses unrelated to the validity of his plea, including claims of ineffective assistance of counsel. *See Mendoza*, 249 Ariz. 180, ¶ 5. Angulo did not argue below that his plea was rendered involuntary or otherwise made invalid by counsel's performance. To the extent he suggests on review that counsel's failure to file a suppression motion "affected [his] decision to plead guilty," we do not address this belated argument. *See State v. Ramirez*, 126 Ariz. 464, 468 (App. 1980).

¶4 We grant review but deny relief.