

**SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS**

No. CR 99-628

COREY SANDERS  
PETITIONER  
  
V.  
  
STATE OF ARKANSAS  
RESPONDENT

Opinion Delivered March 18, 2010

PRO SE PETITION TO REINVEST  
JURISDICTION IN THE TRIAL  
COURT TO CONSIDER A PETITION  
FOR WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS  
[CIRCUIT COURT OF COLUMBIA  
COUNTY,  
CR 97-148]

PETITION DISMISSED.

---

**PER CURIAM**

Petitioner Corey Sanders received a life sentence on a conviction for two counts of capital murder, and this court affirmed the judgment. *Sanders v. State*, 340 Ark. 163, 8 S.W.3d 520 (2000). Petitioner unsuccessfully sought postconviction relief in the trial court under Arkansas Rule of Criminal Procedure 37.1 (2005). *Sanders v. State*, CR 02-1116 (Ark. Oct. 16, 2003) (unpublished per curiam). He twice previously—once proceeding pro se and once represented by counsel—filed a petition in this court to reinvest jurisdiction in the trial court to consider a petition for writ of error coram nobis and was denied relief each time. *See Sanders v. State*, CR 99-628 (Ark. Nov. 11, 2004) (unpublished per curiam).<sup>1</sup> Petitioner has now filed a third such petition that seeks leave from this court to reinvest jurisdiction in the trial court so that petitioner may file a petition for writ of error coram nobis.

---

<sup>1</sup>Petitioner’s second petition to pursue error coram nobis relief, which was filed by retained counsel, was denied by per curiam order on December 6, 2007.

Petitioner's latest petition requesting this court reinvest jurisdiction in the trial court so that he may pursue error coram nobis relief restates, almost verbatim, the same arguments contained in his second petition. Petitioner does not allege any new grounds or additional facts. A subsequent petition that does not allege new grounds or additional facts to cure the deficiencies in the previous petition is an abuse of the writ and does not support renewal of the application. *See Jackson v. State*, 2009 Ark. 572 (per curiam).<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, we dismiss the petition.

Petition dismissed.

*Corey Sanders*, pro se petitioner.

No response.

---

<sup>2</sup>In his tendered reply to the State's response to the petition, petitioner asserts that the "merits" of the second petition were never addressed and that the petition was denied on a procedural basis because it was denied by per curiam order. As we pointed out in *Jackson*, any proceeding in this court on a petition to reinvest jurisdiction in the trial court to consider a petition for writ of error coram nobis is purely a procedural matter.