Pursuant to Ind.Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

FILED
Jul 13 2009, 9:48 am
CLERK
of the supreme court, court of appeals and tax court

APPELLANT PRO SE:

LESTER C. JONES
Westville, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

GREGORY F. ZOELLER
Attorney General of Indiana

MONIKA PREKOPA TALBOT
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

LESTER C. JONES,	)	
	)	
Appellant-Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 79A02-0802-PC-170
	)	
STATE OF INDIANA,	)	
	)	
Appellee-Respondent.	)	

APPEAL FROM THE TIPPECANOE SUPERIOR COURT NO. 2
The Honorable Thomas H. Busch, Judge
Cause Nos. 79D02-0701-PC-1 & 79D02-0004-CF-39

July 13, 2009

MEMORANDUM DECISION – NOT FOR PUBLICATION

RILEY, Judge

Appellant-Petitioner, Lester C. Jones (Jones), appeals the denial of his petition for post-conviction relief. Jones filed his petition, *pro se*, on January 11, 2007. Because Jones proceeded *pro se*, the post-conviction court ordered the cause submitted upon affidavit, pursuant to Indiana Post-Conviction Rule 1, § 9. On March 26, 2007, Jones filed his affidavit. On December 27, 2007, after the State had filed Proposed Statements of Fact and Conclusions of Law, Jones filed a Request for Court Order Allowing Petitioner to File Proposed Statements of Facts and Conclusion of Law. On January 8, 2008, without having ruled on Jones' request, the trial court issued Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law denying Jones' petition for post-conviction relief.

Jones contends that the post-conviction court erred by denying his petition without allowing him to file proposed findings and conclusions. However, he cites no authority for the proposition that the post-conviction court should have allowed him to do so. Moreover, Jones fails to explain what his proposed findings and conclusions would have stated, so we have no basis for concluding that he was prejudiced by the post-conviction court's actions. One who appeals from the denial of a petition for post-conviction relief has the burden of persuading us that the evidence is without conflict and leads to but one conclusion and that the post-conviction court has reached the opposite conclusion. *Hopkins v. State*, 889 N.E.2d 314, 317 (Ind. 2008). Jones has not satisfied this burden.

Affirmed.

KIRSCH, J., and MATHIAS, J., concur.