

Arizona Supreme Court
Criminal Petition for Review - Special Action

CR-26-0158-PR

GILBERT GONZALES OLIVAS v STATE OF ARIZONA

Appellate Case Information

Case Filed: 1-Jun-2026
Case Closed:

Dept/Composition

Side 1. GILBERT GONZALES OLIVAS, Petitioner
(Litigant Group) GILBERT GONZALES OLIVAS

• Gilbert Gonzales Olivas

PRO SE Attorneys for: Petitioner

Side 2. STATE OF ARIZONA, Respondent
(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA

• State of Arizona

Attorneys for: Respondent

J William Brammer, Jr., Esq. (AZ Bar No. 2079)

James William Rappaport, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 31699)

CASE STATUS

Jun 1, 2026.....Pending

PREDECESSOR CASE (S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
2 CA 2 CA-SA 26-0027					
PIM CR20102517-002			Christopher C Browning, Trial Comments: (none)		

4 PROCEEDING ENTRIES

1.	1-Jun-2026	FILED: Petition for Review of a Special Action Decision of the Court of Appeals (Petitioner Olivas, Pro Se)			
2.	1-Jun-2026	FILED: Notice (Treated as a Motion for Stay and Request for Copies) (Petitioner Olivas, Pro Se)			
3.	5-Jun-2026	FILED: Record from CofA: Link to Electronic Record			
4.	10-Jun-2026	On June 1, 2026, Petitioner filed a pro se Petition for Review. His claims arise from a special action proceeding related to his petition for post-conviction relief under Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32. On the same day, Petitioner also filed a "Notice" that the Court will treat as a two-part motion. First, Petitioner says he was unable to serve copies of his Petition to the other parties due to the unavailability of prison staff. He states, "he can pay for the copies and postage if the Court provides him with the amount of the fee." From this, it is not clear what Petitioner is requesting or whether he has submitted any grievance arising from his failure or inability to serve the parties in this matter. See Department Order # 902 (6.0) (discussing charges for qualified legal claims); Department Order # 802 (discussing the inmate grievance procedure). Under Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.21(h), a party filing a petition for review "must serve a copy" of the petition "on all parties who were entitled to service in the Court of Appeals." To the extent Petitioner is requesting that the Court serve the parties in his stead, it declines to do so. The Court will, rather, grant Petitioner an additional thirty days in which to accomplish service and to file a certificate of service. Failure to comply with the rules may result in the dismissal of his petition. See <i>State v. Carriger</i>, 143 Ariz. 142, 146 (1984) (requiring strict compliance with post-conviction procedures). Second, Petitioner requests, if the Court were to grant review, that it enter a "short stay" and that it order the superior court to provide certain hearing transcripts. Petitioner fails to provide a sufficient explanation as to why a stay or such an order is necessary and proper. See <i>Smith v. Arizona Citizens Clean Elections Comm'n</i>, 212 Ariz. 407, 410 ¶¶ 10 (2006) (establishing the elements a party must show when requesting a stay); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.8 (discussing the process for obtaining transcripts). In addition, because this request is conditioned on this Court's granting of review, it is premature. The Court will, therefore, deny the request without prejudice to refile if the Court grants review of his Petition. ... Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Petitioner's first request is denied. Petitioner must serve his Petition and file a certificate of service as required by Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.21(h) by no later than July 10, 2026. This matter is subject to dismissal if the certificate of service is not filed by July 10, 2026. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's second request is denied without prejudice to renew if the Court grants review of his Petition. (Hon. Clint Bolick)			