NOTICE: NOT FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.
UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL
AND MAY BE CITED ONLY AS AUTHORIZED BY RULE.

IN THE

ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF ARIZONA, *Respondent*,

v.

ALBERT ROBERT DUVAL, *Petitioner*.

No. 1 CA-CR 14-0639 PRPC
FILED 11-3-2016

Petition for Review from the Superior Court in Maricopa County
No. CR2008-132425-001
The Honorable Janet E. Barton, Judge

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

COUNSEL

Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Phoenix
By Diane Meloche
Counsel for Respondent

Albert Robert Duval, Florence
Petitioner Pro Se

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Randall M. Howe delivered the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Kenton D. Jones and Judge Donn Kessler joined.

H O W E, Judge:

¶1 Albert Robert Duval petitions this Court for review from the summary dismissal of his petition for post-conviction relief. We have considered the petition for review and, for the reasons stated, grant review but deny relief.

¶2 After a jury trial, Duval was convicted of possession or use of dangerous drugs and sentenced as a repetitive offender to 10 years' imprisonment. This Court affirmed Duval's conviction and sentence on appeal. *State v. Duval*, 1 CA-CR 09-0231 (Ariz. App. Sept. 2, 2010) (mem. decision).

¶3 Duval commenced a timely proceeding for post-conviction relief. Duval's appointed counsel then notified the trial court that she had reviewed the record but found no claims to raise in post-conviction proceedings. Duval filed a *pro se* petition in which he asserted claims of various constitutional rights violations and ineffective assistance of counsel. In summarily dismissing the petition, the trial court issued a ruling that, to the extent the petition was comprehensible, clearly identified, fully addressed, and correctly resolved Duval's claims. Under these circumstances, we need not repeat the trial court's analysis here; instead, we adopt it. *See State v. Whipple*, 177 Ariz. 272, 274, 866 P.2d 1358, 1360 (App. 1993) (holding that when the trial court rules "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 [the] written decision").

¶4 Accordingly, although we grant review, we deny relief.

AMY M. WOOD • Clerk of the Court
FILED: AA