

OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

ROBERT H. GURLEY,)	No. ED99938
)	
Movant/Appellant,)	Appeal from the Circuit Court of the
)	City of St. Louis
vs.)	
)	Honorable Michael F. Stelzer
STATE OF MISSOURI,)	
)	
Respondent.)	Filed: April 15, 2014

Robert Gurley appeals the judgment of the motion court denying, without an evidentiary hearing, his Rule 29.15 motion for post-conviction relief. Gurley contends the motion court erred in denying his motion, because his trial counsel was ineffective for failing to: investigate for the presence of his blood on two knives submitted into evidence, “raise the issue of fact that the deceased was still wearing a gold watch when discovered by police,” and object to the introduction of his prior bad acts into evidence. Gurley also contends that his appellate counsel was ineffective for failing to argue on direct appeal that the trial court erred in allowing his “mug shot” into evidence.

AFFIRMED.

DIVISION FOUR HOLDS: The motion court did not clearly err in denying, without an evidentiary hearing, Gurley’s claims of ineffective assistance of counsel because Gurley failed to identify facts which would have entitled him to relief or demonstrate prejudice.

Opinion by: Lisa S. Van Amburg, J.
Patricia L. Cohen, Judge, and
Philip M. Hess, Judge, concur.

Attorney for Appellant: Amy Lowe
Attorney for Respondent: Jennifer 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.**