Arizona Supreme Court

Criminal Petition for Review-Post Conviction (ASC)

CR-24-0074-PR STATE OF ARIZONA v ALBERTO DAVID MORENO

Appellate Case Information

Case Filed: 18-Mar-2024

Case Closed:

Dept/Composition

Side 1. STATE OF ARIZONA, Respondent

(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA

- **State of Arizona**

Attorneys for: Respondent

Laura Winsky Conover, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 24080)

Side 2. ALBERTO DAVID MORENO, Petitioner

(Litigant Group) ALBERTO DAVID MORENO

- **Alberto David Moreno** PRO SE

CASE STATUS

Mar 18, 2024....Awaiting Petition for Review	**Mar 18, 2024....Pending**

PREDECESSOR CASE(S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
2 CA 2 CA-CR 24-0036 PRPC					
PIM CR20154713001			Danelle B Liwski, Authoring Judge of Order Comments: (none)		
PIM CR20181874001			Danelle B Liwski, Authoring Judge of Order Comments: (none)		

5 PROCEEDING ENTRIES

1.	18-Mar-2024	FILED: Motion for Extension of Time (Petitioner Moreno, Pro Se)
2.	18-Mar-2024	Petitioner Moreno, pro se, filed a "Motion for Extension of Time" on March 18, 2024. Pursuant to Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, 31.6(e) and Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, Rule 6(b), a motion for a procedural order must include a statement by the moving party of whether the other parties consent to, or object to, the entry of the order that is sought; or why the moving party was unable to contact the other parties before filing the motion, and the caption of a motion for procedural order must include the words, “Motion for Procedural Order.” Therefore, IT IS ORDERED the motion is denied without prejudice to Petitioner Moreno’s ability to file a motion in compliance with Arizona Rules of Crim. Proc. Rule 31.6(e) or ARCAP 6(b). This matter is subject to dismissal if a compliant motion or petition for review is not filed by April 2, 2024. (Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk)
3.	8-Apr-2024	FILED: Motion for Procedural Order; Motion for Extension of Time; Motion for Superior Court Index (Petitioner Moreno, Pro Se)
4.	8-Apr-2024	FILED: Notice of Bad Faith by the Clerk - Pima County (Petitioner Moreno, Pro Se)
5.	10-Apr-2024	On March 1, 2024, the Court of Appeals considered the Motion to Supplement Petition for Review filed by Petitioner Moreno, pro se. The Court of Appeals treated the motion as a petition for special action relief from the respondent judge’s denial of Petitioner’s request to further extend the time for filing a petition for review of the denial of post-conviction relief. The Court of Appeals declined to accept jurisdiction. A petition for review in this Court asks the Supreme Court to review a decision of the Court of Appeals. Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.21(a). This Court will not consider in a petition for review matters not raised in the Court of Appeals. Petitioner seeks an extension of time to file his Petition for Review and asks “for an order to the Pima County Superior Court to provide the requested index of record.” Although the Court is inclined to grant a 30-day extension, no further extensions will be granted to enable petition to request or obtain information not presented to the Court of Appeals. IT IS ORDERED granting the request for extension. Petitioner’s petition for review is due no later than May 10, 2024. No further extensions will be granted lacking extraordinary circumstances. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying the request “for an order to the Pima County Superior Court to provide the requested index of record” without prejudice to filing a separate request in each of the superior court cases. (Hon. Clint Bolick)