

## OPINION SUMMARY

### MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

RYAN PATTERSON, Appellant,	)	No. ED101357
	)	
vs.	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
	)	of Cape Girardeau County
STATE OF MISSOURI, Respondent.	)	Hon. William L. Syler
	)	Filed: June 30, 2015

Ryan Patterson (“Movant”) appeals the motion court’s denial of his Rule 29.15 motion for post-conviction relief. Movant argues the motion court clearly erred in denying his Rule 29.15 motion for post-conviction relief because: (1) Movant’s appellate counsel was ineffective for failing to raise a Batson v. Kentucky<sup>1</sup> claim; (2) Movant’s appellate counsel was ineffective for failing to raise a claim about the trial court’s error in sustaining the State’s objections to Movant’s motion to cross-examine the State’s witness Michelle Lawrence about a polygraph test she took that came back inconclusive; and (3) Movant’s trial counsel was ineffective for consenting to a jury being picked from Pemiscot County.

AFFIRMED.

Division Three holds: The motion court did not clearly err in denying Movant’s Rule 29.15 motion for post-conviction relief because Movant’s appellate counsel was not ineffective for failing to raise the Batson claim on appeal. The motion court did not clearly err in denying Movant’s Rule 29.15 motion for post-conviction relief because Movant’s appellate counsel was not ineffective for failing to raise a claim about the trial court’s error in sustaining the State’s objections to Movant’s motion to cross-examine the State’s witness Michelle Lawrence about a polygraph test she took that came back inconclusive. The motion court did not clearly err in denying his Rule 29.15 motion for post-conviction relief because Movant’s trial counsel was not ineffective for consenting to a jury being picked from Pemiscot County.

Opinion by: Robert G. Dowd, Jr., J  
Kurt S. Odenwald, P.J. and Gary M. Gaertner, Jr., J., concur.

Attorney for Appellant:	Jessica Hathaway
Attorney for Respondent:	Jennifer A. Rodewald

**THIS SUMMARY IS NOT PART OF THE OPINION OF THE COURT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE READER AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.**

---

<sup>1</sup> 476 U.S. 86 (1986).