

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 43531

LORENZO CORRAL, ) 2017 Unpublished Opinion No. 367  
 )  
 Petitioner-Appellant, ) Filed: February 16, 2017  
 )  
 v. ) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk  
 )  
 STATE OF IDAHO, ) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED  
 ) OPINION AND SHALL NOT  
 Respondent. ) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Molly J. Huskey, District Judge.

Order summarily dismissing claims in petition for post-conviction relief, affirmed; order denying remaining claim in petition for post-conviction relief, affirmed.

Lorenzo Corral, Boise, pro se appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; John C. McKinney, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; GUTIERREZ, Judge;  
and MELANSON, Judge  
\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Lorenzo Corral appeals from the district court’s summary dismissal of all but one of his claims in his petition for post-conviction relief and from the district court’s order denying the remaining claim following an evidentiary hearing.

Following a jury trial, Corral was convicted of conspiracy to commit first degree murder and conspiracy to commit first degree kidnapping. He appealed his judgment of conviction, which this Court affirmed.<sup>1</sup> Corral filed a petition for post-conviction relief, alleging

<sup>1</sup> *State v. Corral*, Docket No. 41388 (Ct. App. Nov. 3, 2014) (unpublished).

prosecutorial misconduct and numerous instances of ineffective assistance of trial and appellate counsel. The district court summarily dismissed all but one of Corral's claims, reasoning that he did not provide admissible evidence to support his claims. After concluding there was a genuine issue of material fact regarding the remaining claim, an ineffective assistance of trial counsel claim, the district court held an evidentiary hearing. The district court found trial counsel's testimony more credible than Corral's testimony and found there was no deficient performance by trial counsel. Accordingly, the district court denied the remaining claim.

On appeal, Corral again presents the claims from his petition but does not support these claims with relevant authority or argument. When issues on appeal are not supported by propositions of law, authority, or argument, they will not be considered. *State v. Zichko*, 129 Idaho 259, 263, 923 P.2d 966, 970 (1996). Corral attempts to elaborate on his claims in his reply brief. However, we will not consider assignments of error not supported by argument and authority in the opening brief. *Pizzuto v. State*, 146 Idaho 720, 725, 202 P.3d 642, 647 (2008). Moreover, Corral does not identify error by the district court, and we will not presume error. *LaBelle v. State*, 130 Idaho 115, 119, 937 P.2d 427, 431 (Ct. App. 1997).

Corral notes he is not an attorney. However, a pro se litigant is held to the same standards and rules as a litigant appearing with counsel. *State v. Sima*, 98 Idaho 643, 644, 570 P.2d 1333, 1334 (1997). Corral's pro se status does not excuse him from the requirements that he provide authority and argument to support his claims. For all these reasons, we affirm the district court's summary dismissal of all but one of Corral's claims within his petition for post-conviction relief, as well as the district court's denial of the remaining claim following an evidentiary hearing.