APPENDIX
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A — Minnesota Court of Appeals, Order Opinion, No. A25-2041, filed May 21, 2026.

Appendix B — Ramsey County District Court, Order Denying Postconviction Relief, No. 62-CR-12-7811, filed October 6, 2025.

Appendix C — Minnesota Supreme Court, Order Denying Petition for Further Review, No. A25-2041, dated August 12, 2026.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN COURT OF APPEALS

A25-2041

Jonathan Joseph Corbett, petitioner,

Appellant,

vs.

State of Minnesota,

Respondent.

FILED
Clerk of Appellate Courts
Date: 2026.05.21
15:04:36 -05'00'

ORDER OPINION

Ramsey County District Court
File No. 62-CR-12-7811

Considered and decided by Bond, Presiding Judge; Reyes, Judge; and Harris, Judge.

BASED ON THE FILE, RECORD, AND PROCEEDINGS, AND BECAUSE:

1. In September 2012, following a shooting at a birthday party, respondent State of Minnesota charged appellant Jonathan Joseph Corbett with three counts of attempted second-degree murder, one count of second-degree murder, one count of first-degree assault, and two counts of second-degree assault. Minn. Stat. §§ 609.17, subd. (1); .19, subd. 1(1); .221, subd. 1; .222, subd. 1. (2012).

2. The matter proceeded to trial in September 2013. During jury deliberations, a juror gave a note to the judge stating, "On my jury questionnaire, I checked that my husband used to work with [a state witness]. Can my knowledge of his work history be brought in to speak of his character." The juror had previously indicated on her questionnaire that her husband and the state's witness were "old coworker[s]." The judge

wrote "No" on the note with his signature. The jury found Corbett guilty of all charges except one count of attempted second-degree murder.

3. In 2014, Corbett appealed his conviction, and this court affirmed. *State v. Corbett*, No. A14-0290, 2014 WL 7011187, at *1 (Minn. App. Dec. 15, 2014) (*Corbett I*), *rev. denied* (Minn. Feb. 25, 2015).

4. In January 2015, Corbett met with appellate counsel to discuss his knowledge of the alleged juror bias. In March 2015, appellate counsel informed Corbett that his trial counsel waived the issue by choosing not to ask for a mistrial. Appellate counsel also stated that Corbett had exhausted his options for appellate review.

5. In August 2025, Corbett filed a petition for postconviction relief under Minnesota Statutes section 590.01 (2024). Corbett argued that he was entitled to relief based on (1) the presence of juror bias, (2) ineffective assistance of trial and appellate counsel, and (3) the interests of justice.

6. The district court denied Corbett's motion without an evidentiary hearing, concluding that his claims were time-barred and did not satisfy any of the exceptions to the two-year statute of limitations. Corbett appeals.

7. "We review a postconviction court's summary denial of a petition for postconviction relief for an abuse of discretion." *Andersen v. State*, 913 N.W.2d 417, 422 (Minn. 2018). "A postconviction court abuses its discretion when its decision is based on an erroneous view of the law or is against logic and the facts in the record." *Id.* (quotation omitted).

8. A postconviction petitioner is entitled to an evidentiary hearing unless the petition, files, and records of the proceeding "conclusively show that the petitioner is entitled to no relief." Minn. Stat. § 590.04, subd. 1 (2024). A postconviction court is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing if the petitioner "alleges facts that, if true, are legally insufficient to entitle him to the requested relief." *Evans v. State*, 8 N.W.3d 642, 648 (Minn. 2024) (quotation omitted).

9. "No petition for postconviction relief may be filed more than two years after . . . the entry of judgment of conviction or sentence if no direct appeal is filed." Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(a)(1). "A petition that is filed outside the statute of limitations may be summarily denied, unless a statutory exception applies." *Andersen*, 913 N.W.2d at 423 (citations omitted). Relevant to this appeal, a exception to the two-year statute of limitations applies when "the petitioner establishes to the satisfaction of the court that the petition is not frivolous and is in the interests of justice." Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(b)(5). "[T]he interests-of-justice exception is triggered by an injustice that *caused* the petitioner to miss the primary deadline in subdivision 4(a), not the *substance* of the petition." *Sanchez v. State*, 816 N.W.2d 550, 557 (Minn. 2012). In other words, "the petitioner must first allege an injustice that prevented him from meeting the statutory time limit." *Blanche v. State*, 988 N.W.2d 486, 492 (Minn. 2023). "Any petition invoking an exception . . . must be filed within two years of the date the claim arises." Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(c). A claim arises under the interests-of-justice exception "when the petitioner knew or should have known that he had a claim." *Sanchez*, 816 N.W.2d at 560.

A-3

10. The record reflects that Corbett knew or should have known of his juror-bias claim and ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim in 2015. Yet, Corbett did not bring his petition until August 2025, ten years after the claims arose.

11. Corbett argues that his petition falls under the interests-of-justice requirement because it "presents verified facts, supported by a juror's written note and record filings, showing an unreviewed constitutional violation." Corbett further contends that denying his petition would "contradict the constitutional duty of [the] courts to correct manifest injustice." This argument is unavailing.

12. Corbett does not identify a specific injustice that *caused* him to miss the statutory deadline under section 590.01, subdivision 4(b). Instead, the injustices claimed—juror bias and ineffective assistance of counsel—are identical to the substantive claims raised in his petition for postconviction relief. *Sanchez*, 816 N.W.2d at 557 (holding that "[w]hen the only injustice claimed is identical to the substance of the petition," which is "based on something that happened before or at the time a conviction became final," the interests-of-justice exception does not apply).

13. Because the events supporting Corbett's claims for relief were known or should have been known in 2015, the interests-of-justice exception does not apply and we conclude that Corbett's claims are time-barred.

14. Accordingly, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion when it summarily denied Corbett's petition for postconviction relief.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The district court's order denying postconviction relief is affirmed.

2. Pursuant to Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c), this order opinion is nonprecedential, except as law of the case, res judicata, or collateral estoppel.

Dated: May 21, 2026

BY THE COURT

Judge JaPaul J. Harris

A-5

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
10/6/2025 3:06 PM

STATE OF MINNESOTA **DISTRICT COURT**

COUNTY OF RAMSEY **SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

Court File No. 62-CR-12-7811

Jonathan Joseph Corbett,

Petitioner,

vs.

ORDER DENYING POSTCONVICTION RELIEF

State of Minnesota,

Respondent.

The above-entitled matter came administratively before the Court on Mr. Corbett's Petition for Postconviction Relief filed on August 28, 2025. The State filed a response on September 17, 2025.

Based on all the files, records and proceedings, the Court makes the following:

ORDER

1. Petitioner's postconviction relief petition is **DENIED** without hearing.

2. The attached memorandum is incorporated herein and made part of this Order.

BY THE COURT:

Yang, Adam (Judge)
Oct 6, 2025 2:37 PM

Adam C. Yang
Judge of District Court

B-1

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
10/6/2025 3:06 PM

MEMORANDUM

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On February 26, 2013, Jonathan Joseph Corbett was charged by an amended complaint filed in Ramsey County District Court with six counts: (1) Murder in the Second Degree, in violation of Minn. Stat. § 609.19.1(1); (2) Attempted Murder in the Second Degree, in violation of Minn. Stat. §§ 609.19.1(1), 609.11.5, 609.17.1; (3) Attempted Murder in the Second Degree, in violation of Minn. Stat. §§ 609.19.1(1), 609.11.5, 609.17.1; (4) Attempted Murder in the Second Degree, in violation of Minn. Stat. §§ 609.19.1(1), 609.11.5, 609.17.1; (5) Assault in the First Degree, in violation of Minn. Stat. §§ 609.221.1, 609.11.5(b); (6) Assault in the Second Degree, in violation of Minn. Stat. §§ 609.222.1, 609.11.5(b); and (7) Assault in the Second Degree, in violation of Minn. Stat. §§ 609.222.1, 609.11.5(b).

2. On September 25, 2013, the jury trial began. The jury returned guilty verdicts on Counts 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7, and a not guilty verdict on Count 4.

3. On November 20, 2013, Mr. Corbett motioned for a new trial. The motion was denied. Judge Bastian sentenced Mr. Corbett on that same day.

4. On December 15, 2014, the Minnesota Court of Appeals affirmed Mr. Corbett's conviction and sentence on direct appeal. *See State v. Corbett*, A14-0290.

5. On February 25, 2015, the Minnesota Supreme Court denied Mr. Corbett's request to review his petition.

6. On March 5, 2015, the Court of Appeals entered its judgment.

7. On August 28, 2025, Mr. Corbett filed his Petition for Postconviction Relief, (hereinafter "August 28, 2025, Postconviction Petition") for the following reasons: 1) in the interests of justice, 2) ineffective assistance of counsel at trial and on appeal, and 3) implicit juror bias.

B-2

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
10/6/2025 3:06 PM

8. On September 10, 2025, the Office of the Minnesota Appellate Public Defender filed a correspondence stating it will not provide further counsel to Mr. Corbett because he had filed a direct appeal from his conviction, and the matter has since concluded.

9. On September 17, 2025, the State filed a responsive brief to the postconviction request.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner's claim of juror bias is time barred.

2. Petitioner has not established to the satisfaction of this Court that the petition is not frivolous.

3. Petitioner has provided no basis to believe he could not raise a claim involving ineffective assistance of appellate counsel during the two years after his appeal.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

A postconviction court is required to construe *pro se* petitions liberally, looking to the substance and ignoring defects in form. Minn. Stat. § 590.03. When the files and records and alleged facts "conclusively show that the petitioner is entitled to no relief," the postconviction court is within its discretion to deny the petition without a hearing. *See* Minn. Stat. § 590.04, subd. 1; *Patterson v. State*, 670 N.W.2d 439, 442 (Minn. 2003). "When a petitioner alleges facts that, even if true, are legally insufficient to entitle him to the requested relief, the postconviction court need not hold an evidentiary hearing." *Hughes v. State*, 851 N.W.2d 49, 52 (Minn. 2014) (citing Minn. Stat. § 590.04, subd. 1 (2012); *Greer v. State*, 836 N.W.2d 520, 522 (Minn. 2013)). A petitioner *see*king postconviction relief must show that there are material facts in dispute and prove that dispute by a fair preponderance of the evidence. *Erickson v. State*, 725 N.W.2d 532, 534 (Minn. 2007) (citing *Roby v. State*, 531 N.W.2d 482, 483 (Minn. 1995); Minn. Stat. § 590.04, subd. 3 (2004)). Moreover, the allegations contained in the petition must be "more than

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
10/6/2025 3:06 PM

argumentative assertions without factual support." *Hodgson v. State*, 540 N.W.2d 515, 517 (Minn. 1995) (quoting *Beltowski v. State*, 289 N.W.2d 563, 564 (Minn. 1971)).

I. Petitioner's Claim Related to Juror Bias is Time Barred.

In his August 28, 2025, Postconviction Petition, Mr. Corbett claims that his conviction should be vacated because it is based on 1) the interests of justice, 2) ineffective assistance of counsel at trial and on appeal, and 3) implicit juror bias.

Minnesota Statutes section 590.01, subdivision 4(a) establishes that, absent listed exceptions, a petition for postconviction relief must be filed no more than two years after a direct appeal has been taken. The Minnesota Supreme Court has ruled that unless a petitioner can demonstrate the presence of a specified exception, a postconviction court may properly dismiss a postconviction petition filed beyond the two-year time period. *Moua v. State*, 778 N.W.2d 286, 288 (Minn. 2010).

A petitioner's conviction becomes final when the "judgment of conviction has been rendered, the availability of appeal exhausted, and the time for a petition for certiorari [has] elapsed or a petition for certiorari [has been filed and] finally denied." *O'Meara v. State*, 679 N.W.2d 334, 339 (Minn. 2004) (*quoting Griffith v. Kentucky*, 479 U.S. 314, 321 n.6 (1987)), *overruled on other grounds by Danforth v. Minnesota*, 552 U.S. 264 (2008); *see Berkovitz v. State*, 826 N.W.2d 203, 207 (Minn. 2013) ("When a Petitioner does not file a petition for certiorari with the Supreme Court of the United States following our decision on direct appeal, the Petitioner's conviction becomes 'final' 90 days after our decision for purposes of Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(a)(2)").

The postconviction statute does allow for five exceptions to the two-year time bar, none of which apply here. An untimely petition must first satisfy subdivision 4(b) exception for the

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
10/6/2025 3:06 PM

merits of the petition to be considered. *See Henderson v. State*, 906 N.W.2d 501, 508 n.7 (*citing Berkovitz*, 826 N.W.2d at 207). The two-year time bar applies, unless the petitioner establishes: (1) a physical disability or mental disease that prevented a timely filing; (2) newly discovered evidence that could not have reasonably been discovered within the two-year limit, which "establishes by a clear and convincing standard that the petitioner is innocent of the offense or offenses for which the petitioner was convicted"; (3) a new interpretation of law that is retroactively applicable to the petitioner's case; (4) [. . .] or (5) that the petition is not frivolous and is "in the interests of justice." Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(b). Any applicable exception must be invoked within two years of when the petitioner knew or should have known of the basis for the exception. Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(c).

This Court does not find that Mr. Corbett has established any of the exceptions to the two-year time bar. "Under the interests of justice exception to the statutory time bar, a petitioner may file for postconviction relief after the two-year deadline if 'the petitioner establishes to the satisfaction of the court that the petition is not frivolous and is in the interests of justice.'" *Paul v. State*, 20 N.W.3d 48, 56 (Minn. 2025) (quoting Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(b)(5)). The interests-of-justice exception is applied only in exceptional circumstances. *Carlton v. State*, 816 N.W.2d 590, 619 (Minn. 2012); *Gassler v. State*, 787 N.W.2d 575, 586 (Minn. 2010). Any petition invoking any exception also must be filed within two years of the date the claim arises. Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(c); *Colbert v. State*, 811 N.W.2d 103, 105 (Minn. 2012) (citing Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4(c)). The date on which a claim "arises" is determined objectively based on when the petitioner "knew or should have known" that the claim existed, not when the petitioner subjectively knew about the claim. *Sanchez v. State*, 816 N.W.2d 550, 560 (Minn. 2012). He cannot therefore meet the interests-of-justice exception.

Filed in District Court
State of Minnesota
10/6/2025 3:06 PM

Here, Mr. Corbett knew or should have known about any issue with the juror's knowledge or conduct at the time of trial. Any challenge involving the alleged failure of appellate counsel to raise an issue related to the juror on direct appeal was known to Mr. Corbett in 2015, and he was required to bring a postconviction claim related to that failure within two years of the entry of judgment of that appeal.

Lastly, Mr. Corbett has provided no basis to believe he could not raise a claim involving ineffective assistance of appellate counsel during the two years after his appeal. This claim is also untimely.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Corbett's postconviction relief claims are time barred and are without merit. Therefore, the request for postconviction relief is denied.

APPENDIX C

MINNESOTA SUPREME COURT

A25-2041

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR FURTHER REVIEW - AUGUST 12, 2026

FILED
OFFICE OF APPELLATE COURTS
Date: 2026.08.12 15:08:07 -05'00'

STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN SUPREME COURT

A25-2041

Jonathan Joseph Corbett,

Petitioner,

vs.

State of Minnesota,

Respondent.

O R D E R

Based upon all the files, records, and proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition of Jonathan Joseph Corbett for further review is denied.

Dated: August 12, 2026

BY THE COURT:

Natalie E. Hudson

Natalie E. Hudson
Chief Justice