NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P. 65.37

JAY YUNIK

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Appellant

٧.

MICHAEL OVERMYER,

Appellee No. 135 WDA 2014

Appeal from the Order Entered December 30, 2013 In the Court of Common Pleas of Crawford County Criminal Division at No.: CP-20-MD-0000534-2013

BEFORE: PANELLA, J., JENKINS, J., and MUSMANNO, J.

MEMORANDUM BY JENKINS, J. FILED: AUGUST 26, 2014

Jay Yunik appeals from an order denying his habeas corpus motion filed against Michael Overmyer, superintendent of the State Correctional Facility at Forest, where Yunik is presently serving his sentence of 54-180 months' imprisonment for rape. We affirm.

Having examined the record, the briefs of the parties, and the applicable law, and the thorough and well-reasoned opinion of the Honorable John Spataro of the Court of Common Pleas of Crawford County, we conclude that Judge Spataro's opinion accurately disposes of Yunik's claim that he has "a constitutional right to petition the government for grievances against it." Accordingly, we adopt his opinion as our own. **See** Trial Court Opinion (noting that Yunik was sentenced to imprisonment for rape and has filed 4 PCRA petitions, none of which were successful; PCRA subsumes the

J-S24029-14

claims Yunik wishes to pursue in his habeas corpus petition, viz., illegal

police interrogation, invalid affidavit of probable cause, concealment of

exculpatory evidence, illegal arrest, denial of right to counsel at various

stages of case, ineffective assistance of counsel, lack of subject matter

jurisdiction, unlawfully induced guilty plea, lack of factual basis for guilty

plea; none of Yunik's claims are timely under the PCRA's one year statute of

limitations; Yunik fails to plead or prove any exceptions to the one year

statute of limitations; Yunik not prejudiced by the absence of a 20 day notice

of intent to dismiss his petition under Pa.R.Crim.P. 907, since court

entertained his motion for reconsideration after denying his original habeas

corpus motion; Yunik waived objection to the absence of a 20 day notice by

failing to include this objection in his statement of matters complained of on

appeal).

Order affirmed.

Judgment Entered.

Joseph D. Seletyn, Eso

Prothonotary

Date: 8/26/2014

- 2 -