

Arizona Supreme Court
Criminal Petition for Review-Post Conviction (ASC)

CR-26-0188-PR **STATE OF ARIZONA v GARY THOMAS KELLEY**

Appellate Case Information	Dept/Composition
Case Filed: 22-Jun-2026 Archive on: 6-Jul-2036 (planned) Case Closed: 6-Jul-2026	

Side 1. STATE OF ARIZONA, Respondent	
(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA	
• State of Arizona	Attorneys for: Respondent Robert E Prather, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 29390) Rachel H Mitchell, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 14560)

Side 2. GARY THOMAS KELLEY, Petitioner	
(Litigant Group) GARY THOMAS KELLEY	
• Gary Thomas Kelley	PRO SE

CASE STATUS	
Jul 6, 2026.....Case Closed	Jul 6, 2026.....Decision Rendered

PREDECESSOR CASE (S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
2 CA	2 CA-CR 26-0020 PRPC				
↗ MAR	CR2010-123572		Max Covil, Trial Comments: (none)		

CASE DECISION	
06-Jul-2026 ORDER	
* Petitioner Kelley, pro se, filed a "Motion for Procedural Order for Extension of Time to File Petition for Review" on June 22, 2026.	Filed: 06-Jul-2026 Mandate:
On March 16, 2026, the Court of Appeals issued its Memorandum Decision granting review and denying relief of Petiti	Decision Disposition
	Denied Dismissed
John Lopez	

2 PROCEEDING ENTRIES		
1.	22-Jun-2026	FILED: Motion for Procedural Order for Extension of Time to File Petition for Review (Petitioner Kelley, Pro Se)
2.	6-Jul-2026	Petitioner Kelley, pro se, filed a "Motion for Procedural Order for Extension of Time to File Petition for Review" on June 22, 2026.
On March 16, 2026, the Court of Appeals issued its Memorandum Decision granting review and denying relief of Petitioner's successive Rule 32 petition.		
"A party may ask the Supreme Court to review a decision of the Court of Appeals by filing a petition for review." See Rule 31.21(a), Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure. "A party must file a petition for review no later than 30 days after the Court of Appeals enters its decision, unless a party files a timely motion for reconsideration in the Court of Appeals and, in that event, a party must file a petition for review no later than 15 days after the motion's final disposition." See Rule 31.21(b)(2)(A). Any petition for review or request for extension was therefore due no later than April 15, 2026.		
Petitioner does not contend that he did not receive the March 16, 2026 decision timely. He advises that he was unable to file a timely motion or petition for review due to his work schedule and advises, "in addition, with our law library semi closed, [this] has hindered my legal research." However, Petitioner has not provided any explanation for why he was unable to file a timely request for an extension in this Court.		
IT IS ORDERED denying Petitioner's request for extension and dismissing this proceeding as untimely. (Hon. John R. Lopez IV)		