IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

2223

2425

26

FRANK MILFORD PECK,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE; AND THE HONORABLE BRENT T. ADAMS, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Real Party in Interest.

RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On February 3, 2012, this Court ordered the State, on behalf of the Second Judicial District Court, to show cause why this Court should not issue a writ of mandamus directing the district court to evaluate and move forward on a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed by petitioner Peck in 2008.

The State has two responses. First, the appropriate writ is a writ of procedendo, not a writ of mandamus. Second, that 2008 petition has been dismissed.

On February 9, 2011, the district court entered an order dismissing a First Amended Petition. *See* Order dated 2-9-11. On February 10, 2012, a year and a day later, the court entered an order dismissing a supplemental

Electronically Filed

Tracie K. Lindemah

Clerk of Supreme Court

No. 60040 Mar 05 2012 10:29 a.m.

petition, and specified, in footnote 1, that it was dismissing the pleadings of November 21, 2011 and December 12, 2011, and that the original order from a year earlier disposed of the claims raised in the 2008 petition. *See* Order dated 2-10-12.

Petitioner Peck has a propensity to present petitions and supplements and supplemental authority and motions for leave to present supplemental authority rather willy nilly. It is quite difficult to keep track of and make sense of his various pleadings. We do the best we can, however. It is now clear enough that the court dismissed the 2008 petition in an order dated February 9, 2011. Indeed the text of that order includes the sentence that "The Court finds that the petition is procedurally barred..." Not the supplement, or any of the other pleadings, but "the petition." If that were not clear enough, it certainly became clear enough later when the court issued another order, including footnote one, explaining that the order of 2-9-11 applied to the 2008 petition.

The State contends that this Court should deny the petition for writ of mandamus, and any other pending claims for extraordinary relief.

DATED: March 5, 2012.

RICHARD A. GAMMICK DISTRICT ATTORNEY

By: TERRENCE P. McCARTHY Appellate Deputy

FILED

Electronically
02-09-2011:09:21:17 AM
Howard W. Conyers
Clerk of the Court
Transaction # 2022652

Code 3370

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2425

26

27

28

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

FRANK M. PECK,

Case No. CR96P2687

Petitioner,

Dept. No. 6

٧.

STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

ORDER

Petitioner filed: (1) a first amended petition for writ of habeas corpus (post-conviction), and (2) an ex parte motion for appointment of counsel and request for evidentiary hearing pursuant to N.R.S. 34.750.

The Court finds that *Rosas v. State*, 122 Nev. 1258, 147 P.3d 1101 (Nev. 2006) does not retroactively apply to Petitioner's case.

The Court finds that the petition is procedurally barred by the one-year statute of limitations on time to file (Remit., Jun. 4, 2003). See N.R.S. 34.726. The Court also finds that good cause does not exist for Petitioner's delay in filing the petition. See N.R.S. 34.726(1). Thus, an evidentiary hearing is not warranted in this matter. See N.R.S. 34.770(2).

Accordingly, Petitioner's petition is dismissed. Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel is denied.

DATED: This 4th day of February, 2011.

DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

7	ODMIT TOTAL
2	
3	I certify that I am an employee of THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT;
4	that on theday of February, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk
5	of the Court system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following:
6	GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ.
7	
8	Further, I certify that I deposited in the county mailing system for postage and mailing
9	with the U.S. Postal Service in Reno, Nevada, a true copy of the foregoing addressed to:
10	with the U.S. Postal Service in Reno, Nevada, a true copy of the 1910gonny
11	Frank Peck, #57106
12	NNCC PO Box 7000
13	Carson City, NV 89702
14	
15	
16	Judicial Assistant
17	Judiciai Assistant
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

FILED

Electronically 02-10-2012:09:52:00 AM Joey Orduna Hastings Clerk of the Court Transaction # 2757093

Code 3370

2

1

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

2526

27

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

FRANK M. PECK.

٧.

Case No. CR96P2687

Petitioner,

Dept. No. 6

STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

ORDER

Petitioner filed a supplemental petition for writ of habeas corpus ("Supplemental Petition"). In his Petition, Petitioner argues that both his trial and appellate attorneys failed to properly characterize the requested "lesser related" offense jury instructions as "lesser included" offenses under the facts of the case.

The Court finds that the supplemental petition is procedurally barred by the one-year statute of limitations on time to file (Remit., Jun. 4, 2003). See N.R.S. 34.726. The Court also finds that good cause does not exist for Petitioner's delay in filing the petition. See N.R.S. 34.726(1). Thus, an evidentiary hearing is not warranted in this matter. See N.R.S. 34.770(2).

Accordingly, Petitioner's supplemental petition is dismissed and Petitioner's motion for leave to file supplemental points and authorities in support of the writ is moot.

DATED: This 10th day of February, 2012.

DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ This Order encompasses Petitioner's Supplemental Petitions filed on November 21, 2011 and December 12, 2011, respectively. The issues raised in Petitioner's August 7, 2008 Petition were resolved by way of the Court's Order entered on February 9, 2011. (Or. Denying Pet.'s Mot., Feb. 9, 2011).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I certify that I am an employee of THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT; that on the 16th day of February, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following: GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. And, I deposited in the County mailing system for postage and mailing with the United States Postal Service in Reno, Nevada, a true and correct copy of the attached document addressed as follows: Frank M. Peck, #57106 HDSP Box 650 Indian Springs, NV 89070

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Pursuant to NRAP Rule 25, I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Washoe County District Attorney's Office and that on March 5, 2012, I deposited for mailing at Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, postage prepaid, a true copy of the foregoing document, addressed to:

Frank Milford Peck #57106 High Desert State Prison P.O. Box 650 Indian Springs, NV 89070-0650

Shelly Muckel Washoe County District Attorney's Office