

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

Electronically Filed  
Aug 31 2017 03:47 p.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

**BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,**

Petitioner,

vs.

**THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
ROBERT LEGRAND,**

Respondent.

---

**Sup. Ct. Case No. 73095**

**Case No. CR07-1728**

**Dept. 4**

**RECORD ON APPEAL**

**VOLUME 4 OF 11**

**DOCUMENTS**

**APPELLANT**

**Brendan Dunckley #1023236  
Lovelock Correctional Center  
1200 Prison Road  
Lovelock, Nevada 89419**

**RESPONDENT**

**Washoe County District  
Attorney's Office  
Terrance McCarthy, Esq.  
P.O. Box 30083  
Reno, Nevada 89502-3083**

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMITTED FOR FILING	03-02-10	3	407
ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMITTED FOR FILING	06-09-10	3	449
ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMITTED FOR FILING	06-09-10	3	450
ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMITTED FOR FILING	06-09-10	3	451
ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMITTED FOR FILING	06-09-10	3	452
ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMITTED FOR FILING	06-09-10	3	453
ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMITTED FOR FILING	06-09-10	3	454
AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS	07-21-09	7	2-3
AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD AND TRANSFER OF RECORDS	07-07-09	3	301-303
AMENDED INFORMATION	02-28-08	2	205-208
ANSWER TO PETITION AND SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST CONVICTION)	05-05-10	9	624-626
ANSWER TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST CONVICTION)	01-05-17	6	891-893
APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO PRODUCE PRISONER	02-16-17	6	914-916
APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO PRODUCE PRISONER	10-07-10	9	634-636
APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO PRODUCE THE PRISONER	02-23-17	6	926-929
APPLICATION FOR SETTING	07-03-07	2	4-5
APPLICATION FOR SETTING	09-26-07	2	177
APPLICATION FOR SETTING	10-08-07	2	178
APPLICATION FOR SETTING	01-24-11	4	540-541
APPLICATION FOR SETTING	03-11-11	4	543-544
APPLICATION FOR SETTING	07-01-10	9	632
APPLICATION FOR SETTING	11-03-10	9	647-648

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
APPLICATION FOR SETTING	03-11-11	9	653-654
APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS	07-21-09	7	1
BAILBOND POSTED	07-24-07	2	161-166
BAILBOND POSTED	07-24-07	2	167-169
CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	09-09-08	3	273-276
CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	03-01-10	3	401-402
CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	12-30-11	4	708-712
CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	05-19-17	6	968-969
CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	12-30-11	10	813-817
CERTIFICATE OF CLERK	09-10-08	3	277
CERTIFICATE OF CLERK	03-02-10	3	404
CERTIFICATE OF CLERK – RECORD ON APPEAL	06-09-10	3	446
CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL	08-17-17	6	1003
CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL	09-05-12	10	844
CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL – NOTICE OF APPEAL	12-30-11	4	714
CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL – NOTICE OF APPEAL	05-19-17	6	970
CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL – NOTICE OF APPEAL	12-30-11	10	820
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	02-22-17	6	923
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	02-17-10	3	398
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMITTAL	09-10-08	3	278
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMITTAL	03-02-10	3	405
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMITTAL – RECORD ON APPEAL	06-09-10	3	447
CORRECTED ORDER	05-31-11	4	567-569
COURT SERVICES REPORT	07-03-07	2	1-3

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO STATE'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA, SUPPLEMENTAL TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND SUPPLEMENTAL IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA	11-03-10	4	495-508
DESIGNATION OF RECORD ON APPEAL	05-16-17	6	961-964
EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERIM CLAIM FOR FEES	04-01-10	11	28-37
EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERIM CLAIM FOR FEES	06-30-10	11	41-48
EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERIM CLAIM FOR FEES	11-01-10	11	52-60
EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERIM CLAIM FOR FEES	02-10-11	11	67-75
EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERIM CLAIM FOR FEES	06-21-11	11	79-88
EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERIM CLAIM FOR FEES	02-03-12	11	92-101
EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR INTERIM CLAIM FOR FEES	01-03-13	11	105-116
EX PARTE MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND REQUEST FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING	07-21-09	7	4-6
FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND JUDGMENT	06-29-17	6	976-982
FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND JUDGMENT	12-29-11	10	787-793
GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM	03-06-08	2	211-217
INFORMATION	07-12-07	2	6-10
JUDGMENT	08-11-08	3	239-240
MINUTES – ARRAIGNMENT	07-18-07	2	12
MINUTES – CONFERENCE CALL – TELEPHONIC DECISION	08-18-11	4	695
MINUTES – CONFERENCE CALL – TELEPHONIC DECISION	08-18-11	10	785
MINUTES – CRIMINAL PROGRESS SHEET	07-17-07	2	11
MINUTES – ENTRY OF JUDGMENT AND IMPOSITION OF SENTENCE	09-16-08	3	280
MINUTES – EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS TO EXHAUST STATE CLAIMS/ORAL ARGUMENTS ON MOTION TO DISMISS PETITION	08-08-17	6	996

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
MINUTES – MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEA	07-26-11	4	693
MINUTES – MOTION TO CONFIRM TRIAL DATE / ARRAIGNMENT ON AMENDED INFORMATION	06-26-08	2	234
MINUTES – PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST CONVICTION)	07-26-11	10	782-783
MOTION FOR DEFAULT BENCH DECISION FOR THE MOTION(S) TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND SUPPLEMENTALS IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW PLEA	03-18-11	4	546-553
MOTION FOR FEES FOR COPY COSTS	10-25-10	9	641-646
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE	11-25-09	3	382-390
MOTION FOR MODIFICATION OF SENTENCE	07-08-09	3	304-337
MOTION FOR ORDER TO PRODUCE THE PRISONER	10-11-10	9	637
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SETTING	03-28-11	4	554-559
MOTION FOR SETTING OF ORAL ARGUMENTS ON MOTION(S) TO WITHDRAW PLEA	01-21-11	4	533-539
MOTION FOR SUBMISSION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW DEFENDANT’S GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM, SUPPLEMENTAL TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA, AND SUPPLEMENT IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA	11-17-10	4	512-518
MOTION FOR WITHDRAW OF GUILTY PLEA	03-03-10	3	409-423
MOTION TO ALLOW LEAVE TO FILE A BELATED NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK ADMISSION OF OTHER BAD ACT EVIDENCE FOR REBUTTAL PURPOSES	02-04-08	2	182-188
MOTION TO DISMISS PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST CONVICTION)	03-01-17	6	930-937
MOTION TO GRANT PETITIONER’S UNOPPOSED WRIT FOR HABEAS CORPUS TO EXHAUST STATE CLAIMS	01-11-17	6	898-903
MOTION TO STRIKE STATE’S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT’S MOTION(S) TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM & MOTION FOR SUBMISSION OF DECISION	12-30-10	4	519-524
MOTION TO SUBMIT MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND ALSO DEFENDANT’S SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA	09-21-10	3	475-478

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
NOTICE OF APPEAL	09-08-08	3	270-272
NOTICE OF APPEAL	03-01-10	3	399-400
NOTICE OF APPEAL	12-30-11	4	700-706
NOTICE OF APPEAL	05-16-17	6	957-960
NOTICE OF APPEAL	12-30-11	10	795-806
NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS	11-05-10	4	509-511
NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS	05-16-17	6	965-967
NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS	02-16-12	10	835-837
NOTICE OF CHANGE OF RESPONSIBLE ATTORNEY	01-05-17	5	888-890
NOTICE OF DOCUMENT RECEIVED BUT CONSIDERED BY THE COURT	08-05-08	2	235-238
NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER	06-30-17	6	985-993
NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER	01-11-12	10	824-832
NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK ADMISSION OF OTHER ACTS EVIDENCE FOR PURPOSES OF REBUTTAL	02-04-08	2	189-200
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD AND TRANSFER OF RECORDS	07-07-09	3	297-300
NOTICE REGARDING TRANSCRIPT AT PUBLIC EXPENSE	01-11-12	11	26-27
NOTICE TO FILE DOCKETING STATEMENT AND REQUEST TRANSCRIPTS	10-06-08	3	281
OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR MODIFICATION OF SENTENCE	11-04-09	3	361-363
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO GRANT PETITIONER'S UNOPPOSED WRIT FOR HABEAS CORPUS TO EXHAUST STATE CLAIMS	01-23-17	6	904-906
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO STRIKE STATE'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND SUPPLEMENT IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA	01-03-11	4	525-527
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA, SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND SUPPLEMENT IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA	10-21-10	4	490-493

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
ORDER	10-23-09	3	354-356
ORDER	10-27-09	3	358-359
ORDER	02-10-10	3	391-393
ORDER	04-12-10	3	438-440
ORDER	04-23-10	3	442-444
ORDER	07-08-10	3	461-463
ORDER	10-15-10	4	480-482
ORDER	01-07-11	4	529-531
ORDER	05-31-11	4	563-565
ORDER	11-21-16	5	884-885
ORDER	02-15-17	6	909-911
ORDER	03-28-17	6	952-954
ORDER	10-28-09	9	587-588
ORDER DENYING MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEAS	12-29-11	4	697-698
ORDER GRANTING IN FORMA PAUPERIS	10-28-09	9	584-586
ORDER GRANTING STIPULATION FOR CONTINUANCE OF HEARING DATE	03-11-11	9	655-656
ORDER TO PRODUCE PRISONER	02-21-17	6	919-920
ORDER TO PRODUCE PRISONER	10-12-10	9	638-639
ORDER TO SET	06-17-10	9	628-630
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST CONVICTION)	07-21-09	7	7-83
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO EXHAUST STATE CLAIMS	11-07-16	5	734-883
PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT	08-05-08	11	1-25
PRETRIAL ORDER	07-20-07	2	155-160
PROCEEDINGS	07-19-07	2	13-154
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTORNIC FILING	03-11-11	9	658

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	10-23-09	3	357
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	10-27-09	3	360
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	11-04-09	3	364
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	11-25-09	3	381
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	02-10-10	3	394
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-01-10	3	403
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-02-10	3	406
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-02-10	3	408
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-04-10	3	425
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-18-10	3	434
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	04-12-10	3	441
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	04-23-10	3	445
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	06-09-10	3	448
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	06-09-10	3	455-456
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	06-16-10	3	458
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	07-08-10	3	464
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	09-16-10	3	474
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	09-21-10	4	479
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	10-15-10	4	483
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	10-15-10	4	489
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	10-21-10	4	494
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-03-11	4	528
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-07-11	4	532
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-24-11	4	542
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-11-11	4	545



APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	05-31-11	4	566
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	05-31-11	4	570
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	07-13-11	4	692
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	07-26-11	4	694
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	08-18-11	4	696
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-29-11	4	699
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-30-11	4	707
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-30-11	4	713
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-30-11	4	715
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-03-12	5	721
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-09-12	5	723
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-11-12	5	724
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-24-13	5	727
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	02-14-13	5	733
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	10-28-09	9	589
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-14-09	9	593
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-17-10	9	596
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	05-05-10	9	627
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	06-17-10	9	631
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	07-01-10	9	633
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	10-12-10	9	640
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	11-03-10	9	649
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	02-14-11	9	652
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-11-11	9	657
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	06-21-11	9	659

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

<b>PLEADING</b>	<b>DATE FILED</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	07-13-11	10	781
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	07-26-11	10	784
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	08-18-11	10	786
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-29-11	10	794
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-30-11	10	812
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-30-11	10	818
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-30-11	10	819
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	12-30-11	10	821
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-09-12	10	823
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-11-12	10	833
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	02-03-12	10	834
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	02-16-12	10	838
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	03-12-12	10	839
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	08-13-12	10	841
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	09-04-12	10	843
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	09-05-12	10	845
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-03-13	10	846
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	01-24-13	10	852
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	02-06-13	10	853
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING	02-14-13	10	862
RECOMMENATION AND ORDER GRANTING DEFENSE FEES	11-09-10	11	61-63
RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	12-14-09	9	590-592
RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES	04-22-10	11	38-40
RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES	07-16-10	11	49-51

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES	11-15-10	11	64-66
RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES	03-08-11	11	76-78
RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES	07-01-11	11	89-91
RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES	03-12-12	11	102-104
RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES	02-06-13	11	117-119
REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE, STIPULATION AND ORDER	03-03-08	2	209-210
REQUEST FOR ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT	10-13-08	3	282-285
REQUEST FOR ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT	01-03-12	5	716-720
REQUEST FOR ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT	12-30-11	10	807-811
REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION	09-30-09	3	352-353
REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION	11-25-09	3	379-380
REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION	02-17-10	3	395-397
REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION	05-09-11	4	560-562
REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION	03-14-17	6	948-949
REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION OF MOTION	03-22-10	3	435-437
REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION OF MOTION	06-17-10	3	459-460
REQUEST, STIPULATION AND ORDER RE PRE- PRELIMINARY HEARING AND PRE-TRIAL RECIPROCAL DISCOVERY (FELONY AND GROSS MISDEMEANOR CASES)	02-25-08	2	201-204
RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S NOTICE AND MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ATTORNEY OR RECORD AND TRANSFER OF RECORDS	07-23-09	3	338-347
RESPONSE TO STATE'S MOTION TO DISMISS	03-13-17	6	940-947
RESPONSE TO STATES OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR MODIFICATION OF SENTENCE	11-13-09	3	365-378
RETURN OF NEF	11-21-16	5	886-887

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
RETURN OF NEF	01-05-17	6	894-895
RETURN OF NEF	01-05-17	6	896-897
RETURN OF NEF	01-23-17	6	907-908
RETURN OF NEF	02-15-17	6	912-913
RETURN OF NEF	02-16-17	6	917-918
RETURN OF NEF	02-21-17	6	921-922
RETURN OF NEF	02-22-17	6	924-925
RETURN OF NEF	03-01-17	6	938-939
RETURN OF NEF	03-14-17	6	950-951
RETURN OF NEF	03-28-17	6	955-956
RETURN OF NEF	05-19-17	6	971-972
RETURN OF NEF	05-23-17	6	974-975
RETURN OF NEF	06-29-17	6	983-984
RETURN OF NEF	06-30-17	6	994-995
RETURN OF NEF	08-08-17	6	997-998
RETURN OF NEF	08-17-17	6	1001-1002
RETURN OF NEF	08-17-17	6	1004-1005
RETURN OF NEF	08-29-17	6	1008-1009
STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION	03-17-10	9	594-595
STIPULATION AND ORDER VACATING HEARING	10-19-07	2	179-181
STIPULATION FOR CONTINUANCE OF HEARING DATE	02-14-11	9	650-651
SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA	03-04-10	3	426-432
SUPPLEMENTAL IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA	07-14-10	3	465-471
SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST CONVICTION)	03-23-10	9	597-623

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR PETITIONER'S POST CONVICTION WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PETITION – PART NO. II	07-21-09	7	84-209
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR PETITIONER'S POST CONVICTION WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PETITION – PART NO. IV	07-21-09	8	302-443
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR PETITIONER'S POST CONVICTION WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PETITION – PART NO. V	07-21-09	9	444-583
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR PETITIONERS POST – CONVICTION WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PETITION – PART NO. III	07-21-09	8	210-301
SUPREME COURT CLERK'S CERTIFICATE & JUDGMENT	06-03-09	3	291
SUPREME COURT CLERK'S CERTIFICATE & JUDGMENT	10-15-10	4	485
SUPREME COURT CLERK'S CERTIFICATE & JUDGMENT	02-14-13	5	731
SUPREME COURT CLERK'S CERTIFICATE & JUDGMENT	02-14-13	10	855
SUPREME COURT ORDER DIRECTING ENTRY AND TRANSMISSION OF WRITTEN ORDER	08-17-17	6	999-1000
SUPREME COURT ORDER DIRECTING TRANSMISSION OF RECORD	03-18-10	3	433
SUPREME COURT ORDER DIRECTING TRANSMISSION OF RECORD	08-29-17	6	1006-1007
SUPREME COURT ORDER GRANTING MOTION AND DIRECTING DISTRICT CLERK TO TRANSMIT DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL	09-04-12	10	842
SUPREME COURT ORDER GRANTING MOTION AND DIRECTING DISTRICT COURT CLERK TO TRANSMIT DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL	08-13-12	10	840
SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE	05-11-09	3	286-289
SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE	06-03-09	3	292-296
SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE	09-16-10	3	472-473
SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE	10-15-10	4	486-488
SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE	01-24-13	5	725-726
SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE	02-14-13	5	728-730

APPEAL INDEX  
 SCN 73095  
 CASE NO. CR07-1728  
 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY vs STATE OF NEVADA, ROBERT LEGRAND  
 Date: AUGUST 31, 2017

PLEADING	DATE FILED	VOL.	PAGE NO.
SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE	01-24-13	10	847-851
SUPREME COURT RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS	09-15-08	3	279
SUPREME COURT RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS	03-04-10	3	424
SUPREME COURT RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS	06-16-10	3	457
SUPREME COURT RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS	01-09-12	5	722
SUPREME COURT RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS	05-23-17	6	973
SUPREME COURT RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS	01-09-12	10	822
SUPREME COURT REMITTITUR	06-03-09	3	290
SUPREME COURT REMITTITUR	10-15-10	4	484
SUPREME COURT REMITTITUR	02-14-13	5	732
SUPREME COURT REMITTITUR	02-14-13	10	854
SURPEME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE	02-14-13	10	856-861
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS – ARRAIGNMENT – JULY 17, 2007	08-16-07	2	170-176
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS – MOTION TO CONFIRM TRIAL – THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2008	04-02-08	2	218-233
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS – MOTION TO WITHDRAW PLEA – FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 2011	07-13-11	4	571-691
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS – MOTION TO WITHDRAW PLEA – FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 2011	07-13-11	10	660-780
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS – SENTENCING – AUGUST 5, 2008	09-05-08	3	241-269
WITHDRAWAL OF ATTORNEY	07-23-09	3	348-351

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\*  
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 09-21-2010:15:33:30  
**Clerk Accepted:** 09-21-2010:16:01:27  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Motion  
**Filed By:** Lori Matheus

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY  
STATE OF NEVADA  
KELLI VILORIA, ESQ.

1 **CODE 3370**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**  
7 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

8  
9 **THE STATE OF NEVADA,**

10 **Plaintiff,**

**Case No. CR07-1728**

11 **vs.**

**Dept. No. 4**

12 **BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,**

13 **Defendant.**

14 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
15 **ORDER**

16 On February 10, 2010, an Order Denying Motion for Modification of Sentence  
17 was filed. On March 1, 2010, the Defendant filed a Notice of Appeal to the Supreme  
18 Court. On March 3, 2010, the Defendant filed a Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On  
19 March 4, 2010, the Defendant filed a Supplemental Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On  
20 March 22, 2010, the Defendant formally submitted the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea to  
21 the Court for decision. On April 23, 2010, this Court entered an Order staying Decision on  
22 the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea pending the outcome of the appeal to the Supreme  
23 Court. On June 17, 2010, the Defendant again formally submitted the Motion to Withdraw  
24 Guilty Plea to the Court for decision, which was again stayed pending the outcome of the  
25 appeal to the Supreme Court. On July 14, 2010, the Defendant filed an additional  
26 Supplement to the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On September 16, 2010, the Supreme  
27 Court of Nevada entered an Order Affirming the District Court's decision on the Order  
28 Denying Motion for Modification of Sentence. On September 21, 2010, the Defendant



1 submitted the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and Defendant's Supplemental Motions to  
2 Withdraw Guilty Plea to the Court for decision.

3 The Court having reviewed the pleadings filed herein, with good cause  
4 appearing and in the interests of justice,

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the State shall file a Response to the Motion  
6 to Withdraw Guilty Plea and Defendant's Supplemental Motions to Withdraw Guilty Plea  
7 within twenty (20) days of the date of this order.

8 Dated this 12 day of October, 2010.

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

*Connie J. Steinheimer*  
DISTRICT JUDGE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I am an employee of the SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of the STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE; that on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2010, I electronically filed the Order with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system, which sent a notice of electronic filing to the following:

Gary Hatlestad, Esq.  
Chief Deputy District Attorney

I further certify that on the 18<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2010, I deposited in the county mailing system for postage and mailing with the U.S. Postal Service, a true copy of the same, addressed to:

Brendan Dunckley  
Inmate no. 1023236  
Lovelock Correctional Center  
1200 Prison Road  
Lovelock, Nevada 89419

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marci L. Stone

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 10-15-2010:16:04:06  
**Clerk Accepted:** 10-15-2010:16:04:53  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Order...  
**Filed By:** Marci Trabert

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY  
STATE OF NEVADA  
KELLI VILORIA, ESQ.

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

**Supreme Court No. 55545**  
District Court Case No. CR071728

4

**REMITTITUR**

TO: Washoe District Court Clerk

Pursuant to the rules of this court, enclosed are the following:

Certified copy of Judgment and Opinion/Order  
Receipt for Remittitur

DATE: October 05, 2010

Tracie Lindeman, Clerk of Court

By: Tiffany Maccagno  
Deputy Clerk

cc (without enclosures):  
Brendan Dunckley  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Washoe County District Attorney  
Hon. Connie J. Steinheimer, District Judge

**RECEIPT FOR REMITTITUR**

Received of Tracie Lindeman, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, the  
REMITTITUR issued in the above-entitled cause, on 10-11-10

*Sari Matthews*  
District Court Clerk : HOWARD W. CONYERS  
CLERK OF THE COURT  
WASHOE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

**Supreme Court No. 55545**  
District Court Case No. CR071728

4

**CLERK'S CERTIFICATE**

STATE OF NEVADA, ss.

I, Tracie Lindeman, the duly appointed and qualified Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true and correct copy of the Judgment in this matter.

**JUDGMENT**

The court being fully advised in the premises and the law, it is now ordered, adjudged and decreed, as follows:

"ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED."

Judgment, as quoted above, entered this 9<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2010.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the Supreme Court at my Office in Carson City, Nevada this October 05, 2010.

Tracie Lindeman, Supreme Court Clerk

By: Tiffany Maccagno  
Deputy Clerk



FILED

Electronically  
10-15-2010:04:43:29 PM  
Howard W. Conyers  
Clerk of the Court  
Transaction # 1786258

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 55545

CR07-1728  
4

FILED

SEP 09 2010

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY: *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying a motion to modify sentence.<sup>1</sup> Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; Connie J. Steinheimer, Judge.

In his motion filed on July 8, 2009, appellant claimed that he was innocent and requested the court vacate his conviction. Appellant failed to demonstrate that the district court relied on mistaken assumptions regarding his criminal record that worked to his extreme detriment. See Edwards v. State, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). We therefore conclude that the district court did not err in denying appellant's motion. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.


*[Signature]*, J.  
Hardesty

*[Signature]*, J.  
Douglas

*[Signature]*, J.  
Pickering

<sup>1</sup>This appeal has been submitted for decision without oral argument, NRAP 34(f)(3), and we conclude that the record is sufficient for our review and briefing is unwarranted. See Lockett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

cc: Hon. Connie J. Steinheimer, District Judge  
Brendan Dunkley  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Washoe County District Attorney  
Washoe District Court Clerk



COURT STAMP  
CERTIFIED COPY

This document is a full, true and correct copy of  
the original on file and of record in my office.

DATE: October 9, 2010  
Supreme Court Clerk, State of Nevada

By [Signature] Deputy

QUI PRO DOMINA JUSTITIA SEQUITUR



**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 10-15-2010:16:43:29  
**Clerk Accepted:** 10-15-2010:16:44:05  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Supreme Court Remittitur  
Supreme Ct Clk's Cert &Judg  
Supreme Court Order Affirming  
**Filed By:** Lori Matheus  
You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY  
STATE OF NEVADA  
KELLI VILORIA, ESQ.

1 CODE #2645  
RICHARD A. GAMMICK  
2 #001510  
P. O. Box 30083  
3 Reno, Nevada 89520-3083  
(775)328-3200  
4 Attorney for Plaintiff

5  
6 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
7 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

8 \* \* \*

9 THE STATE OF NEVADA,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

Case No. CR07-1728

12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

Dept. No. 4

13 Defendant.  
14 \_\_\_\_\_/

15 OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA, SUPPLEMENT  
16 TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND SUPPLEMENT IN  
17 CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA

18 Comes now, the State of Nevada, by and through counsel to submit this Opposition to  
19 the above-mentioned motions. This Opposition is based on the accompanying points and  
20 authorities.

21 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

22 The upshot of Dunckley's submissions is fairly simple. He pleaded guilty to offenses he  
23 thought were subject to a grant of probation, but, by law, were not subject to probation. As a  
24 result, his plea was not knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily entered. *Aswegan v. State*, 101  
25 Nev. 760, 710 P.2d 83 (1985); *Heimrich v. State*, 97 Nev. 358, 630 P.2d 1224 (1981); *Meyer v.*  
26 *State*, 95 Nev. 885, 603 P.2d 1066 (1979); *overruled by Little v. Warden*, 117 Nev. 845, 849-51,  
34 P.3d 540 (2001)(wherein the Court overruled prior case law to the extent that it held that

1 the district court's lack of advisement on the record about nonprobationality is per se manifest  
2 error). It necessarily follows that if probation was not available, the Court should grant the  
3 motion, but if probation was available, or where it appears, in examining the totality of the  
4 circumstances, that a defendant knew that probation was available at the time of the entry of  
5 the guilty plea, the Court should deny the motion. How the Court resolves this dispute revolves  
6 around NRS 176A.100, NRS 176A.110, and their antecedents, particularly, NRS 176.185.

7 Count I alleged that Dunckley committed the crime of lewdness with a child under the  
8 age of fourteen between August 1998 and August 2000. Dunckley contends that probation was  
9 not available for this offense during all or part of that time frame. We disagree.

10 Even though the charge, as alleged, covers a two year period of time, our Legislature had  
11 made probation available for this offense during the entirety of that time frame. *See* 1997  
12 Statutes of Nevada, pp. 2504-5, esp. Sec. 7(3)(j) and Sec. 9(1); 1997 Statutes of Nevada, p.  
13 2509, Sec. 13; 1997 Statutes of Nevada, p. 1187, Sec. 13; 1999 Statutes of Nevada, p. 565, Sec.  
14 67; 1999 Statutes of Nevada, p. 1192, Sec.10(1)(a), (c). Accordingly, this Court properly advised  
15 Dunckley of the consequences of his plea.<sup>1</sup>

16 Insofar as Count II is concerned, it alleged that Dunckley committed attempted sexual  
17 assault on March 10, 2008. Probation was available for that offense at that time. *See* NRS  
18 176A.100(1); NRS 176A.110(1), (3)(a).

19 In sum, since all of Dunckley's complaints in his moving papers—unknowing plea,  
20 ineffective assistance and prosecutorial misconduct—depend on the validity of his central  
21 premise—the unavailability of probation—and that premise has now been negated, his entire  
22 argument lacks merit. As a result, his request for plea withdrawal should be denied.

23 / / /

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup>It should be noted that, in 2003, the Legislature decided that probation would no longer  
26 be available for lewdness with a child. *See* 2003 Statutes of Nevada, p. 2827, Sec. 3; Statutes of  
Nevada, p. 2828, Sec. 4.

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any person.

DATED: October 21, 2010.

RICHARD A. GAMMICK  
District Attorney

By /s/ GARY H. HATLESTAD  
GARY H. HATLESTAD  
Chief Appellate Deputy

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Washoe County District Attorney's Office and that, on October 21, 2010, I deposited for mailing through the U.S. Mail Service at Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, postage prepaid, a true copy of the foregoing document, addressed to:

Brendan Dunckley #1023236  
Lovelock Correctional Center  
1200 Prison Road  
Lovelock, NV 89419

Robert W. Story, Esq.  
245 E. Liberty Street, Suite 530  
Reno, NV 89501

/s/ SHELLY MUCKEL  
SHELLY MUCKEL

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 10-21-2010:09:06:16  
**Clerk Accepted:** 10-21-2010:09:11:25  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Opposition to Mtn  
**Filed By:** GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ.

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY  
STATE OF NEVADA  
KELLI VILORIA, ESQ.

FILED

3880

CR07-1728  
DC-9900021170-009  
STATE VS BRENDAN DUNCKLEY 14 Pages  
District Court 11/03/2010 09 18 AM  
Washoe County  
3880  
DOC

1 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY # 1023236  
2 LOVELOCK CORRECTIONAL CENTER  
3 1200 PRISON ROAD  
4 LOVELOCK, NEVADA 89419

10 NOV -3 AM 9:18  
HOWARD W. CONYERS  
BY *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY

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

9 THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
10 PLAINTIFF CASE NO: CR07-1728

11 VS. DEPT. NO: 4

12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,  
13 DEFENDANT,

15 DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO STATE'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION  
16 TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA, SUPPLEMENTAL TO MOTION TO  
17 WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND SUPPLEMENTAL IN CONSIDERATION  
18 OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA

20 COMES NOW, DEFENDANT, BRENDAN DUNCKLEY, AND SUBMITS TO  
21 THIS COURT THE RESPONSE TO THE ABOVE-MENTIONED MOTIONS. THIS  
22 RESPONSE TO OPPOSITION IS BASED ON THE ACCOMPANYING POINTS  
23 AND AUTHORITIES.

24 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

25 THE STATE IN IT'S OPPOSITION STATED THAT THE ARGUMENT IN  
26 CONNECTION TO THE ABOVE-MENTIONED MOTION IS A SIMPLE ISSUE,  
27 ONE THAT CAN EASILY BE DENIED, AT THE BASIC EXAMINATION OF

1 NRS 176A.110. FIRST AND FOREMOST THE STATE LISTED AS IT'S AUTHORITY  
2 ASWEGAN V. STATE, 101 NEV. 760, 710 P.2d 83 (1985); HEIMRICH V. STATE,  
3 97 NEV. 358, 630 P.2d 1224 (1981); MEYER V. STATE, 95 NEV. 885, 603 P.2d  
4 1066 (1979); OVERRULED BY LITTLE V. WARDEN, 117 NEV. 845, 849-51, 34 P.3d  
5 540, (2001)

6 THE BASIS FOR ALL THESE CASES WERE THAT PROBATION WAS  
7 NOT SPECIFICALLY INFORMED TO THE DEFENDANT UPON THE ENTRANCE  
8 OF THE PLEA OF GUILTY. INCLUDING MY CURRENT 'CELLIE' LITTLE, C.,  
9 IN LITTLE V. WARDEN. THE ERROR IN THIS ARGUMENT AS A FOUNDATION  
10 TO OPPOSE THE MOTIONS UNDER ATTACK, IS THESE CASES ARE THE  
11 EXACT OPPOSITE. AT NO POINT WAS THERE EVER ANY ARGUMENT  
12 THAT PROBATION WAS NOT MENTIONED. TO BE SPECIFIC PROBATION  
13 WAS DIRECTLY REFERENCED TO IN THE RECORD AS A VIABLE SENTENCING  
14 OPTION FOR THIS COURT TO CONSIDER A TOTAL OF ONE HUNDRED  
15 AND TWELVE (112) TIMES. (UP TO AND INCLUDING THE SUPREME  
16 COURT'S AFFIRMATION)

17 ONCE AGAIN ALLOW THE ISSUES TO BE PRESENTED AGAIN.  
18 THE ARGUMENT IS NOT IN QUESTION OF NRS 176A.110, ESPECIALLY  
19 IMPORTANT SINCE MR. HATLESTAD STATED ON PAGE 2 SO PERFECTLY  
20 STATED THE 'ISSUE':

21 "IT NECESSARILY FOLLOWS THAT IF PROBATION WAS NOT  
22 AVAILABLE, THE COURT SHOULD GRANT THE MOTION." (2;2-3)

23 "HOW THE COURT RESOLVES THIS DISPUTE REVOLVES AROUND  
24 NRS 176A.110...." (2;5,6)

25 "COUNT I ALLEGED THAT DUNCKLEY COMMITTED THE CRIME OF  
26 LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF FOURTEEN BETWEEN  
27 AUGUST 1998 AND AUGUST 2000. DUNCKLEY CONTENDS THAT PROBATION



1 WAS NOT AVAILABLE FOR THIS OFFENSE DURING ALL OR  
2 PART OF THAT TIME FRAME. WE DISAGREE. (2) 7-9)

3 "EVEN-THOUGH THE CHARGE, AS ALLEGED, COVERS A TWO YEAR  
4 PERIOD OF TIME, OUR LEGISLATURE HAD MADE PROBATION AVAILABLE  
5 FOR THIS OFFENSE DURING THE ENTIRETY OF THAT TIME FRAME.

6 SEE 1997 STATUTES OF NEVADA, PP 2504-5, ESP. SEC 7(3)(J) AND  
7 SEC 9 (1); 1997 STATUTES OF NEVADA, P. 2509, SEC. 13; 1997 STATUTES  
8 OF NEVADA P. 1187, SEC. 13; 1999 STATUTES OF NEVADA, P. 567, SEC 67; 1999  
9 STATUTES OF NEVADA, P. 1192, SEC. 10 (1)(W)(C). ACCORDINGLY, THIS COURT  
10 PROPERLY ADVISED DUNCKLEY OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF HIS PLEA" (2) 10-15)

11 "IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT IN 2003, THE LEGISLATURE DECIDED  
12 THAT PROBATION WOULD NO LONGER BE AVAILABLE FOR LEWDNESS  
13 WITH A CHILD. SEE 2003 STATUTES OF NEVADA, P. 2827, SEC. 3;  
14 STATUTES OF NEVADA, P. 2828, SEC. 4." (FN 1)

15 IN RESPECT FOR THE LEARNED MR. HATLESTAD, AS I HAVE PREVIOUSLY  
16 NOTED I HAVE RESPECT FOR. BUT I DISAGREE.

17 AS ALWAYS THIS RESPONSE WILL DISERT THE STATE'S EXACT VERBAGE.  
18 AND ONCE AGAIN SHOW HOW THE STATE HAS MADE THE ARGUMENT  
19 FOR THIS MOTION TO BE GRANTED IN IT'S ENTIRETY.

20 LETS BEGIN WITH LINE 10(B)-11 AS NOTED BY BOLD PRINT  
21 ABOVE "... OUR LEGISLATURE HAD MADE PROBATION AVAILABLE FOR THIS  
22 OFFENSE DURING THE ENTIRETY OF THAT TIME PERIOD." THAT IS  
23 INCORRECT. AT NO POINT CAN A PERSON EVER BE CONVICTED OF  
24 VIOLATING, NRS. 176A.110. SO IT IS NOT A CRIMINAL OFFENSE AND  
25 THUS BECOMES A 'SECONDARY STATUTE'. WITH THAT SAID, MR.  
26 HATLESTAD IS CORRECT, NRS 176A.110 DID INCLUDE THE OFFENSE  
27 OF "(J) LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD PURSUANT TO NRS 207, 230" UP UNTIL

1 JUNE 10, 2003. BUT BY ALL MEANS LETS BE SPECIFIC. ON PAGE  
2 2828 SEC. 4 (2003 NEVADA STATUTES) IT SAYS: " NRS 176A.110 IS HEREBY  
3 AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS: 176A.110 1. THE COURT SHALL  
4 NOT GRANT PROBATION TO OR SUSPEND THE SENTENCE OF A PERSON  
5 CONVICTED OF AN OFFENSE LISTED IN SUBSECTION 3 UNLESS... "  
6 CONVICTED OF AN OFFENSE, THUS NOT A CRIME. SO THE 'OFFENSE'  
7 CONVICTED OF IS THE 'PRIMARY STATUTE' A VIOLATION OF NRS 201.230.  
8 FORGIVE MY 'USE' OF MR. HATLESTAD'S FOOTNOTE FOR MY OWN  
9 BENEFIT. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT, IN 1997, THE LEGISLATURE  
10 DECIDED THAT PROBATION WOULD NO LONGER BE AVAILABLE FOR  
11 LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER FOURTEEN YEARS OF AGE. (NRS  
12 201.230). SEE 1997 STATUTES OF NEVADA, CHAPTER 524, PP 2502-3,  
13 (DELETING SECTION 6 RELATING TO PROBATION); 1997 STATUTES OF NEVADA. CHAPTER  
14 455, P. 1722 (MAKING A VIOLATION OF NRS 201.230 A CATEGORY 'A' FELONY  
15 WITH THE SENTENCE OF LIFE IN PRISON WITH PAROLE AVAILABLE AFTER TEN YEARS)  
16 NOW LETS EXAMINE THIS INFORMATION AND 'SPELL IT OUT!'  
17 NRS 201.230 IS THE ACTUAL CHARGE / CRIME AND THAT IS THE  
18 CHARGE THE DEFENDANT PLED GUILTY TO, NOT NRS 176A.110. AS  
19 A BASIC EXPLANATION OF COMMON SENSE, A SECONDARY  
20 STATUTE THAT IS SIMPLY A 'LIST' OF PROBATIONABLE SEXUAL  
21 OFFENSES, DOES NOT SUPERCEDE THE PRIMARY OFFENSE. IN  
22 LEGAL TERMS IF THE DECISION OF THE 1997 LEGESLATURE  
23 WERE SPECIFIC AND NOT AMBIGUOUS IN ITS INTENTIONS TO  
24 NO LONGER ALLOW CONSIDERATION OF PROBATION TO NRS 201.230.  
25 A SECONDARY STATUTE CAN NOT NEGATE THE INTENT OF THE  
26 LEGISLATIVE DECISION.

27 AS A COMMON LEGAL CONTENTION IS THAT A GUILTY PLEA

1 AGREEMENT AS THIS MOTION DEALS WITH, IS GENERALLY COVERED  
2 BY THE STANDARD OF CONTRACT LAW, TEMPERED WITH THE AWARENESS  
3 OF DUE PROCESS.

4 A 'INSTRUCTIVE TOOL' RECOGNIZED BY THE COURTS IS THE  
5 CORPUS JURIS SECUNDUM (CJS), VOLUME 17A TO BE USED AS  
6 REFERENCE TO FOLLOWING STATUTES (§).

7 "A MUTUAL MISTAKE OCCURS WHEN BOTH PARTIES, AT TIME OF  
8 CONTRACTING, SHARE A MISCONCEPTION ABOUT A VITAL FACT, UPON  
9 WHICH THEY BASE THEIR BARGAIN." GRAMANZ V. GRAMANZ, (113 NEV. 1, 930  
10 P. 2A 753) (NEVADA 1997)

11 §150 STATES THAT WHEN ONE OR MORE PARTY MISUNDERSTOOD  
12 THE LAW AT THE TIME OF THE CONTRACT BEING ENTERED INTO  
13 AND THE OTHER PARTY KNOWS ABOUT THIS MISUNDERSTANDING, BUT  
14 FAILS TO RECTIFY SAME, RECISSION IS PERMITTED.

15 §156 A MATERIAL MISSTATEMENT, WHEN RELIED UPON, AVOIDS A  
16 CONTRACT, BECAUSE THE STATED SUBJECT MATTER OR TERMS OF IT  
17 DID NOT INFECT EXIST.

18 SINCE THIS DIRECT OPPOSITION IS BASED SOLEY ON NRS 176A.110  
19 AND THE STATES FAILURE TO INTERPET NRS 201.230 (1997 C. 524)  
20 CORRECTLY, THIS WILL BE ARGUED CONTRACTURALLY IN THAT ISSUE  
21 TO START. BUT SINCE NUMBER 4 OF THE INDICIA LISTED IN THE  
22 PRIMARY MOTION FILED TEN MONTHS AGO WAS "4) VIOLATION OF  
23 PLEA AGREEMENT BY THE PROSECUTION." THE INITIAL ARGUMENT OF  
24 NRS 201.230 /176A.110 WILL BE ADDRESSED, FOLLOWED BY CONTRACT  
25 LAW PROVING BREACH BY THE STATE.

26 §208 SHOWS THAT A CONTRACT IS 'PLAINLY ILLEGAL' WHEN  
27 MADE CONTRARY TO A STATUTE OR REGULATION EITHER BECAUSE OF

1 SOME ACTIONS OR STATEMENTS, ANY SUCH ILLEGALITY VOIDS AN  
2 ENTIRE CONTRACT.

3 THE FACT THAT THE INTENTIONS OF THIS 'CONTRACT' WAS TO  
4 IMPLY AND INDUCE THE BELIEF, BY BOTH THE LETTER OF THE  
5 CONTRACT AND BY THE COMMENTS OF ALL ATTORNEYS, THAT PROBATION  
6 WAS AVAILABLE. AS THE OPPOSITION CLEARLY CLAIMS, IN DIRECT  
7 VIOLATION OF NRS. 201.230, MAKING THE 'CONTRACT' ILLEGAL.

8 IF AN AGREEMENT OR CONSIDERATION CONTAINED IN A 'CONTRACT'  
9 IS IN EFFECT ILLEGAL, IT IS NOT RENDERED LEGAL BY A DIRECT  
10 OR IMPLIED PROVISION IN A 'CONTRACT' THAT IT'S PURPOSE IS A  
11 LAWFUL ONE, OR BY THE FACT THAT THE ILLEGAL AGREEMENT IS  
12 INCIDENT TO THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF A LAWFUL PURPOSE. MERE  
13 WORDS AND INGENUITY OF CONTRACTUAL EXPRESSIONS, WHATEVER  
14 THEIR EFFECT BETWEEN THE PARTIES CANNOT BY DESCRIPTION MAKE  
15 PERMISSIBLE A COURSE OF CONDUCT FORBIDDEN BY LAW.

16 SINCE A GUILTY PLEA AGREEMENT HAS BEEN RULED BY THE  
17 COURTS TO STAND AND FALL AS AN ENTIRETY, WHERE PART OF THE  
18 CONSIDERATION IS ILLEGAL (AS IS THE INTENT TO ALLOW PROBATION)  
19 BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THE LAW, THE ENTIRE CONTRACT IS VOID, IF  
20 THE CONTRACT IS ENTIRE AND INDIVISIBLE, AS ARE GUILTY PLEAS.

21 IN SUM, TO CONSIDER PROBATION WHEN IT IS RESTRICTED BY  
22 STATUTES, TO DO CONTRARY TO A LAW IS AN ILLEGAL CONTRACT AND  
23 AS SUCH CAN NOT BE ENFORCED OR ALLOWED TO STAND. THE USUAL  
24 REMEDY TO A WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEA BECAUSE OF A BREACH  
25 BY THE STATE IS 1) ALLOWANCE OF DEFENDANT'S WITHDRAWAL OF HIS  
26 GUILTY PLEA AND GO TO TRIAL ON ORIGINAL CHARGES; OR 2) SPECIFICALLY  
27 ENFORCE THE AGREEMENT. SINCE SUCH ENFORCEMENT WOULD BE

1 ILLEGAL, THE LATTER IS NOT AN OPTION.

2 "WHEN PARTIES ATTEMPT TO FASHION A SENTENCE THAT IS IN  
3 ITSELF IS CONTRARY TO LAW, ASSUMING THAT THE TRIAL COURT  
4 ERRONIOUSLY APPROVES OF SUCH AN ILLEGAL BARGAIN, PLEA  
5 MUST BE REGARDED AS INVALID AND INVOLUNTARY." (CRAIG V. PEOPLE,  
6 (986 P.2d 951) (COLO. 1999).

7 "PLEA BARGAINING AGREEMENTS CANNOT EXCEED STATUTORY  
8 AUTHORITY GIVEN TO THE COURTS." MATTER OF GARNER, (617 P.2d 1001,  
9 94 WASH. 2d. 504) (WASH. 1980)

10 §161 GIVES ANOTHER EXTREMELY RELEVANT AREA OF 'FRAUD'  
11 THAT THE STATE AND DEFENSE ATTORNEY O'MARA PREFORMED THAT  
12 CONSTITUTES A BREACH BY THE STATE AND INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF  
13 COUNSEL BY O'MARA. SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH.

14 "SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH BY ONE OR TWO PARTIES TO A CONTRACT  
15 IS AS AFFIRMATIVE A FRAUD AS A FALSE STATEMENT OF FACT.  
16 SINCE IT PREVENTS THE MINDS OF THE PARTIES FROM MEETING  
17 ON THE ACTUAL TERMS OF THEIR CONTRACT." MORRIS V. MCGOUGH,  
18 (230 S.W. 1092)

19 THE RULE OF CRIMINAL / CONTRACT LAW THAT FAILURE TO  
20 DISCLOSE FACTS IS NOT FRAUD DOES NOT APPLY WHERE THE  
21 CIRCUMSTANCES ARE SUCH TO IMPOSE A DUTY TO DISCLOSE THEM, THUS,  
22 WHERE, WITH INTENT TO DECEIVE A PARTY TO A CONTRACT CONCEALS  
23 MATERIAL FACTS WHICH GOOD FAITH REQUIRES HIM OR HER TO  
24 DISCLOSE, THIS IS EQUIVALENT TO A FALSE REPRESENTATION, FRAUD.

25 THE RULE OF CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS REFER TO THE INTENTIONAL  
26 WITHHOLDING OF 'MATERIAL EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE' AS A SERIOUS  
27 CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS

1 BY ADA VILORIA BEING IN POSSESSION OF THE WASHOE COUNTY  
 2 CRIME LAB REPORT DATED MAY 21, 2007, STATING THE DNA TEST  
 3 RESULT TO COUNT II 'NO FOREIGN DNA TO SCURSE, BRENDAN  
 4 DUNCKLEY, WAS OBTAINED FROM GENITAL SWABS. AND NEVER  
 5 INTRODUCING THIS INFORMATION TO THE COURTS, SHOWING THAT  
 6 THERE IS 'QUESTION' AS TO THE FACTUAL BASIS THE 'CONTRACT'  
 7 IS BASED ON. (FED. RULES, CRIMINAL PROC. 11(h)) NOR CORRECTING  
 8 JUDGE STEINHEIMER FROM ACCEPTING A GUILTY PLEA AND STATING:  
 9 "YOU PICKED SOMEONE YOU DIDN'T KNOW, AND YOU COMMITTED A  
 10 SEXUAL ASSAULT ON HER." (SENTENCING P. 27; 16, 17)

11 ON FEBRUARY 7, 2008, THREE DAYS AFTER SHE OFFERED THIS  
 12 'CONTRACT' ADA VILORIA FAXED THIS 'REPORT' TO DEFENSE ATTORNEY  
 13 O'MARA, WHO KNOWINGLY ALLOWED THE 'CONTRACT' TO BE ENTERED  
 14 INTO ON MARCH 6, 2008, WITH NEVER INFORMING HIS CLIENT OF  
 15 THE SCIENTIFIC TEST RESULT THAT CLEARS HIM.

16 AT NO POINT ON MARCH 6, 2008 OR AUGUST 5, 2008 DID EITHER  
 17 OF THESE 'OFFICERS OF THE COURT' DO THEIR DUTY TO SPEAK UP AND  
 18 BRING THIS INFORMATION FOWARD, SUCH SILENCE FORMS A BASIS  
 19 FOR ACTIONABLE FRAUD, WHEN THERE IS A DUTY TO SPEAK. NOT  
 20 ONLY WAS IT A SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH, BUT IT WAS AN ACT OF  
 21 INTENTIONAL FRAUD ON THE COURT.

22 THIS 'INSTANCE' OF FRAUD IS A SMALL AREA OF FRAUD, THIS  
 23 DEFENDANT CAN SHOW, PROVE, ESTABLISH, INSTANCING AMOUNTING TO  
 24 INTENTIONAL VIOLATION OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING (NRS. 104.1203)  
 25 MUNN V. THORTON, (956 P.2d 1213, 1220) (ALASKA 1998); MUTUAL MISTAKE OF  
 26 BOTH LAW AND FACT; (NRS 201.230, 1997 C. 524) GRAMANZ V. GRAMANZ; CJS  
 27 § 148, 149, 150, 153, 156, 158, 160, 161, 163, 164, 195, 196, 197, 199, 208, 213, 215, 297 & 333

1 MISINTERPETATION OF LAW, MISSTATEMENT OF FACT, FRAUDULENT INDUCE-  
2 MENT AND ILLEGALITY OF CONTRACT IN GENERAL.

3 THE STATES CONTINUAL IGNORANCE AT THE COST OF THE  
4 DEFENDANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, BY NOT INTERPETING THE LAWS  
5 THAT THEY ARE ENTRUSTED WITH, TO BOTH KNOW AND DEFEND, CORRECTLY  
6 IS INEXCUSABLE. THIS ARGUMENT MADE BY MR. HATLESTAD IS THE  
7 EXACT SAME AS HIS OPPOSITION TO MR. O'MARA'S DIRECT APPEAL  
8 THE ARGUMENT HAS NOT CHANGED, NETHER HAS HIS 'IGNORANCE OF  
9 LAW', 'MISINTERPETATION OF LAW', 'MISTAKE OF LAW', TO THE FACT THAT AS THIS  
10 MOTION HAS STATED, THROUGH ALL THE 'MOVING PAPERS' THAT 1) NRS 201.230  
11 DOES NOT ALLOW FOR PROBATION AFTER OCTOBER 1, 1997, AND 2) NO MATTER  
12 HOW MANY TIMES THE STATE NOTES IT NRS 176A.110 DOES NOT CHANGE  
13 THE LAW AND MIRACULOUSLY ALLOW PROBATION.

14 AS I HAVE STATED PRIOR, AND MR. HATLESTAD KNOWS, I HAVE THE  
15 UTMOST RESPECT FOR HIM, BUT THAT DOES NOT NEGATE THE FACT THAT  
16 ADA KELLI VILORIA'S ACTION, CONDUCT, COMMENTS, BEHAVIOR BREACHED  
17 THE 'CONTRACT' LONG BEFORE THIS CASE EVER LANDED ON HIS DESK. THE  
18 PASSAGE OF TIME DOES NOT CHANGE THE FACT THAT KELLI VILORIA  
19 WHILE HOLDING THE PRECIOUS TITLE OF PROSECUTOR ABUSED THAT SACRED PUBLIC  
20 TRUST, INTENTIONALLY VIOLATING THE 'CONTRACT' BY 1) WITHHOLDING EXCULPATORY  
21 EVIDENCE; LIED TO AND MISLED JUDGE STEINHEIMER; 2) FAILED TO UPHOLD THE  
22 'SPIRIT' OF THE CONTRACT, BY HER ANIMATED ARGUMENT TO THE MAXIMUM  
23 SENTENCE TO BOTH CHARGES; 3) BY ORIGINALLY INSTITUTING THIS MISTAKEN  
24 INTERPETATION OF THE LAWS (NRS 201.230 / 176A.110); 4) TRUE, THE STATE DID  
25 RESERVE IT'S RIGHT TO ARGUE AT SENTENCING, BUT IT (ADA VILORIA) COMMITTED  
26 A BREACH BY INTENTIONALLY CIRCUMVENTING THE CONTRACT, AND THIS  
27 INCLUDES THE 'SPIRIT', WHAT THE DEFENDANT REASONABLY UNDERSTOOD WHEN HE

1 ENTERED INTO THIS 'CONTRACT'. SULLIVAN V. STATE, (96 P.3d 761, 120 NEV. 537);  
2 CITY V. STATE, (807 P.2d 724, 107 NEV. 89); STATZ V. STATE, (944 P.2d 813, 113 NEV. 987)

3 THE COURTS HAVE RULED REPEATEDLY THAT "ANY DOUBT AS TO  
4 WHETHER THE PLEA WAS VOLUNTARY MUST BE RESOLVED IN FAVOR OF THE  
5 DEFENDANT." STATE V. SCHOONOVER, (973 P.2d 230, 293 MONT 54) (MONT. 1999).

6 BY ADA VILORIA AND UNBELIEVABLY, DEFENSE ATTORNEY DAVID OIMARA  
7 WITHHOLDING A MATERIAL FACT, AS BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY DEFINES:

8 "PLEADINGS AND PRACTICE: ONE WHICH IS ESSENTIAL TO THE CASE  
9 DEFENSE, APPLICATION, ECT, AND WITHOUT WHICH IT COULD NOT BE SUPPORTED  
10 ONE WHICH TENDS TO ESTABLISH ANY ISSUES RAISED. THE MATERIAL FACTS  
11 OF AN ISSUE OF FACTS ARE SUCH AS ARE NECESSARY TO DETERMINE  
12 THE ISSUE. MATERIAL FACTS ARE ONE UPON WHICH OUTCOMES OF  
13 LITIGATIONS DEPEND." (2nd ED. P. 881)

14 THIS COURT NEEDS TO ACCEPT THE OBVIOUS ISSUE, HOW CAN THERE BE  
15 ANY CONFIDENCE IN THE OUTCOME OF ANY LITIGATION, WHETHER BY WAY OF  
16 A 'CONTRACT' OR A JURY TRIAL, IF THE 'OFFICERS OF THE COURT' CHOSE NOT  
17 TO LET THE DEFENDANT, OR JUDGE AWARE OF SERIOUS MATERIAL FACTS?

18 WITH THE 'FORMAL' INTRODUCTION OF THE LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2008  
19 IN WHICH ADA VILORIA OFFERED AN TENTATIVE 'OFFER' THAT IS THE IDENTICAL  
20 TERMS, CHARGES, STIPULATIONS, CONSIDERATIONS, SENTENCING OFFERS, AS  
21 THE 'CONTRACT' PRESENTED TO THE DEFENDANT ON MARCH 6, 2008 IS OF  
22 HUGE IMPORTANCE, THIS LETTER IN CONNECTION TO THE PREVIOUSLY EVIDENCE  
23 ENTERED OF THE FAX DATED FEBRUARY 7, 2008, IN AND OF ITSELF IT  
24 ESTABLISHES INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. IN THE LAST  
25 TWO YEARS OF LEGAL RESEARCH, REVIEWING AND READING AROUND  
26 3,000 CASES, AS MANY WEST VOLUMES POSSIBLE AND EVEN THOUGH  
27 THERE ARE COUNTLESS CASES OF PROSECUTORS WITHHOLDING 'BRADY'



1 EVIDENCE. BUT I HAVE NOT SEEN ANY CASE THAT THE DEFENSE  
2 COUNSEL HAD EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE TO CLEAR HIS CLIENT AND  
3 THEY HID THE EVIDENCE. UNTIL I HAD DAVID O'MARA AS AN ATTORNEY.

4 IN 1948 SUPREME COURT JUSTICE BLACK SAID: "THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL  
5 GUARANTEED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION CONTEMPLATES THE SERVICE OF AN  
6 ATTORNEY DEVOTED SOLEY TO THE INTREST OF HIS CLIENT... UNDIVIDED  
7 ALLEAGANCE AND FAITHFUL, DEVOTED SERVICE TO A CLIENT ARE PRIZED  
8 TREASURES OF AN AMERICAN LAWYER. IT IS THIS KIND OF SERVICE FOR  
9 WHICH THE SIXTH AMENMENT MAKES PROVISION. AND NOWHERE IS THIS  
10 SERVICE DEEMED MORE HONORABLE THAN IN A CASE OF APPOINTMENT  
11 TO REPRESENT AN ACCUSED TOO POOR TO HIRE A LAWYER!"

12 "AN ATTORNEY WHO ADOPTS OR ACTS UPON A BELIEF THAT HIS  
13 CLIENT SHOULD BE CONVICTED, FAILS TO FUNCTION IN ANY MEANINGFUL WAY  
14 AS THE GOVERNMENTS ADVESARY." OSBORNE V. SHILLINGER, (861 F.2d 612, 625)  
15 & U.S. V. CRONIC, (466 US 648, 658-9, 104 U.S.S.CT. 2039, 2046-7, 80 L.ED.2d 657)

16 BY ATTORNEY O'MARA FAILING TO ACT AS THE STATES ADVESARY, HE  
17 CONSTRUCTIVELY DENIED THE DEFENDANT OF ANY TYPE OF COUNSEL, HE JOINED  
18 THE STATE IN AN EFFORT TO OBTAIN A CONVICTION OF HIS CLIENT.  
19 THEREBY SUCH CONDUCT WAS A CONFLICT OF INTREST.

20 "THE COURTS HAVE HELD THAT DEPRIVATION OF THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL  
21 IS SO INCONSISTANT WITH THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL, THAT IT CAN  
22 NEVER BE TREATED AS HARMLESS ERROR" FRAZIER V. U.S., (18 F.3d 788)

23 THERE IS NO EXCUSE, NO EXPLANATION, NO WAY TO IGNORE OR 'SKATE  
24 OVER' ALL THE ISSUES, LITERALLY SCREAMING TO BE RECOGNIZED AND TO BE  
25 CORRECTED. I FIND IT APPAULING THAT MR. HADLESTAD FELT IT WAS SO  
26 SIMPLE AN ISSUE, SO THAT TO STATE: "THE UPSHOT OF DUNCKLEY'S  
27 SUBMISSION IS FAIRLY SIMPLE," THEN, "IN SUM, SINCE ALL DUNCKLEY'S COMPLAINTS

1 IN HIS MOVING PAPERS - UNKNOWN PLEA, INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE AND  
2 PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT - DEPENDS ON THE VALIDITY OF HIS CENTRAL  
3 PREMISE - THE UNAVAILABILITY OF PROBATION.

4 BUT IT HAS BEEN TEN MONTHS AND THE STATE STILL SEEMS  
5 TO VIEW ALL THE OTHER ISSUES AFOREMENTIONED TO BE UNIMPORTANT.  
6 AFTER ALL THEY ALREADY DID THEIR JOB AND GOT A CONVICTION AT  
7 ANY COST. EVEN IF IT WAS AT THE COST OF A CITIZEN'S PESKY  
8 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

9 THIS MOTION WAS NOT INTENDED, NOR MEANT TO BE SO LENGTHY,  
10 BUT CONSIDERING THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS MOTION, I FELT IT TO BE  
11 IMPERRATIVE TO SHOW ONCE AGAIN, ALL THE ISSUES THAT GO TO THE  
12 ACCEPTABLE 'SCOPE' FOR A MOTION TO WITHDRAW A GUILTY PLEA. IN  
13 ANALYZING THIS 'CONTRACT' WHILE RESEARCHING AND REVIEWING CONTRACT  
14 LAW, WARRENTING RECISSION, OR AVOIDANCE I WAS ABLE TO DRAFT  
15 22 PAGES.

16 OUR SYSTEM OF JUSTICE REPRESENTS A RULE OF LAW BASED ON THE  
17 PREMISE /PRINCIPLE THAT OFFICERS OF THE COURT ARE BOUND BY AND MUST  
18 ACT WITHIN THE LAW. PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS AND APPOINTED COUNSEL  
19 OCCUPY A SPECIAL POSITION OF PUBLIC TRUST. SOCIETY RELIES ON  
20 THESE PUBLIC SERVANTS TO BE HONORABLE ADVOCATES FOR NOT JUST  
21 THE COMMUNITY ON WHOSE BEHALF THEY LITIGATE, BUT ALSO THE  
22 JUDICIAL SYSTEM OF WHICH THEY ARE AN INTEGRAL PART. WHEN AN  
23 ATTORNEY BETRAYS THEIR SOLEMN OBLIGATION, AND ABUSE THE IMMENSE  
24 POWER THEY HOLD, THE FAIRNESS OF OUR ENTIRE SYSTEM OF JUSTICE  
25 IS CALLED INTO DOUBT, AND PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN IT IS UNDER-  
26 MINED.

27 AS A FINAL CITATION OF AUTHORITY THAT IS A PERFECT FIT IS

1 STATE V. BENNETT, (81 P.3d 1, 119 NEV.589) (NEVADA 2003) " A PROSECUTOR  
2 HAS A DUTY TO BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE COURTS OR OF PROPER  
3 OFFICIALS ALL SIGNIFICANT EVIDENCE SUGGESTIVE OF INNOCENCE OR  
4 MITIGATION. AT TRIAL THIS DUTY IS ENFORCED BY THE REQUIREMENTS  
5 OF DUE PROCESS. BUT AFTER A CONVICTION THE PROSECUTOR IS  
6 ALSO BOUND BY THE ETHICS OF HIS OFFICE TO INFORM THE  
7 APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY OF AFTER ACQUIRED OR OTHER INFORMATION  
8 THAT CASTS DOUBT UPON THE CONFIDENCE, CORRECTNESS OR VALIDITY  
9 OF THE CONVICTION."

10 IT HAS BEEN USEFUL TO UTILIZE MR. HATLESTAD'S OPPOSITION  
11 AS A 'JUMPING OFF POINT'. SO I USE HIS CONCLUSION. THIS ENTIRE  
12 ARGUMENT HOLDS SUBSTANTIAL, SUPPORTED, VERIFIED MERITS, AS A  
13 RESULT THE REQUEST FOR PLEA WITHDRAWAL SHOULD BE GRANTED.

14 IN THE INTREST OF JUSTICE, CONSTITUTIONAL REMEDY IS NEEDED, BY  
15 NOT ONLY GRANTING THIS MOTION, BUT ALSO CONSIDERATION AFTER  
16 THE REVERSAL OF THIS CONVICTION, A FULL DISMISSIAL OF ALL  
17 RELATED CHARGES WITH EXTREME PREJUDICE.

18 IN ADDITION TO WHATEVER OTHER RELIEF THIS HONORABLE COURT  
19 DEEMS APPROPRIATE TO GRANT IN THIS MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA,  
20 IN ADDITION TO ALL PREVIOUS PRAYERS FOR RELIEF IN PRIOR MOTIONS

21  
22 DATED: OCTOBER 28, 2010

23  
24 Brendan Dunchley # 1023236

25 BRENDAN DUNCHLEY # 1023236

26 DEFENDANT IN PRO SE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1  
2 I DO CERTIFY THAT I MAILED A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE  
3 FOREGOING MOTION TO THE BELOW ADDRESSES ON THE 28<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF  
4 OCTOBER, 2010, BY PLACING SAME IN THE U.S. MAIL VIA PRISON LAW  
5 LIBRARY STAFF, PURSUANT TO NRCF 5(b):

6  
7 CLERKS OF THE COURT WASHOE COUNTY D.A.  
8 SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT % GARY HATLESTAD  
9 P.O. Box 30083 P.O. Box 30083  
10 RENO, NEVADA 89520-3083 RENO NV. 89520-3083

11  
12 ROBERT STORY ESQ.

Brendan Dunchley #1023236

13  
14 OCTOBER 28, 2010

15  
16  
17 AFFIRMATION IN PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

18 THE UNDERSIGNED DOES HEREBY AFFIRM THAT THE RECEIVING DOCUMENT  
19 FILED IN DISTRICT COURT CASE NO: CR07-1728 DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL  
20 SECURITY NUMBER OF ANY PERSON.

21 DATED THIS 28<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2010

22  
23 

24 BRENDAN DUNCHLEY #1023236

25 DEFENDANT IN PRO SE.

DC-9500021248-012  
CRO7-1728 BRENDAN DUNKLEY ( 3 Pages  
STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNKLEY ( 3 Pages  
District Court 11/05/2010 08:40 AM  
Washoe County 2610  
MATHIE  
NOC

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No: CRO7-1728  
Dept No: 4

2010 NOV -5 AM 8:40

HOWELL W. BRYERS  
BY: [Signature]  
DEPUTY

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

--oo0oo--

STATE of NEVADA )  
Plaintiff )  
vs )  
BRENDAN DUNKLEY )  
Defendant (s) )

Case No: CRO7-1728

**NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS**

TO: THE CLERK OF THE Second JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE.

Please be advised and enter into the records of the above  
entitled case the following change of address:

NEW ADDRESS: N.N.C.C. #1023236  
P.O. Box 7000  
Carson City, Nev. 89702  
OLD ADDRESS: L.C.C. #1023236  
1200 Prison Road  
Lovelock, Nev. 89419


Please direct all further Courth mail to the New Address herein  
noticed.

Respectfully Submitted this 1<sup>st</sup> day of November 2010

[Signature]  
Plaintiff  
Defendant Pro Per

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL**

Pursuant to N.R.C.P. Rule 5 (b), I hereby certify that I am the petitioner/Defendant named herein and that on this 1<sup>st</sup> day of NOVEMBER 2010, I mailed a true a correct copy of the foregoing document to the following:

  
DEFENDANT

Clerk of the Court  
P.O. Box 30083  
Reno, Nevada 89520-3083

W.C.D.A. % G. HARLETON  
P.O. Box 30083  
Reno, Nev. 89520-3083

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**AFFIRMATION**  
**Pursuant to NRS 239B.030**

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document, \_\_\_\_\_

CHANGE of Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title of Document)

filed in case number: CR07-1728

Document does not contain the social security number of any person

-OR-

Document contains the social security number of a person as required by:

A specific state or federal law, to wit:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(State specific state or federal law)

-or-

For the administration of a public program

-or-

For an application for a federal or state grant

-or-

Confidential Family Court Information Sheet  
(NRS 125.130, NRS 125.230 and NRS 125B.055)

Date: 11/1/10

  
(Signature)

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236  
(Print Name)

Defendant in Case  
(Attorney for)

FILED

3860

1 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236  
2 NORTHERN NEVADA CORRECTIONAL CENTER  
3 P.O. Box 7000  
4 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

10 NOV 17 PM 2:48

HOWARD W. CONYERS

BY [Signature]  
DEPUTY

DC-9900021495-025  
CR07-1728 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY ( 7 Pages  
STATE VS BRENDAN DUNCKLEY ( 7 Pages  
District Court 11/17/2010 02 48 PM 3860  
Washoe County  
DOC

5  
6 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE  
7 OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

8  
9 THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
10 PLAINTIFF, CASE NO: CR07-1728  
11 VS. DEPT. NO: 4

12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,  
13 DEFENDANT

14  
15 MOTION FOR SUBMISSION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW  
16 DEFENDANT'S GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM, SUPPLEMENTAL  
17 TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA, AND SUPPLEMENT  
18 IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA

19  
20 COMES NOW, DEFENDANT, BRENDAN DUNCKLEY, AND SUBMITS TO THIS  
21 COURT THE ABOVE-MENTIONED MOTIONS. THIS MOTION TO SUBMIT IS  
22 BASED ON THE COURT'S INHERENT AUTHORITY AND THE DEFENDANT'S  
23 RIGHT TO WITHDRAW A GUILTY PLEA TO CORRECT A MANIFEST INJUSTICE  
24 UNDER NRS 176.165.

25 ALL MOTIONS UNDER ABOVE-MENTIONED MOTIONS AND THIS MOTION  
26 TO SUBMIT FOR DECISION, AND ALL PAPERS, PLEADINGS AND DOCUMENTS  
27 ON FILE HEREIN, ARE BASED ON THE ACCOMPANYING POINTS AND



1 AUTHORITY.

2 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

3 ON MARCH 3, 2010 THIS DEFENDANT'S ORIGINAL MOTION  
4 FOR WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEA WAS SUBMITTED. FOLLOWED BY THE  
5 SUPPLEMENTAL TO MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA ON MARCH 4,  
6 2010, SUPPLEMENT IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY  
7 PLEA ON JULY 10, 2010, A MOTION TO SUBMIT MOTION TO WITHDRAW  
8 GUILTY PLEA AND ALSO DEFENDANT'S MOTION, SUPPLEMENTAL TO WITHDRAW  
9 GUILTY PLEA ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2010. ON OCTOBER 12, 2010 THIS  
10 HONORABLE COURT ORDERED A RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO BE  
11 FILED BY THE STATE IN TWENTY (20) DAYS. THE STATE FILED ITS  
12 OPPOSITION ON OCTOBER 21, 2010. A RESPONSE TO STATE'S OPPOSITION  
13 WAS FILED PROMPTLY ON OCTOBER 25, 2010. (OR THERE ABOUT).

14 AS A TOTAL OF MORE THAN FIVE DAYS HAVE PASSED, THE  
15 DEFENDANT SUBMITS THESE MOTIONS FOR DECISION.

16 IN ADDITION TO THE RESPONSE TO THE STATE'S OPPOSITION  
17 WHICH AS MENTIONED PRIOR IS GROSSLY FLAWED IN ITS  
18 INTERPRETATION OF THE LAW, MR. HARLESTAD MADE ANOTHER POINT  
19 THAT THE COURT SHOULD TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION.

20 SPECIFIC ATTENTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE FOLLOWING DIRECT  
21 REFERANCES TO THE STATES OPPOSITION FILED ON OCTOBER 21, 2010.

22 "COUNT I ALLEGED, THAT DUNKLEY..." (pg 2; 7); "EVEN THOUGH THE  
23 CRIME, AS ALLEGED,..." (2; 10); AND, "INSOFAR AS COUNT II IS  
24 CONCERNED, IT ALLEGED,..." (2; 16)

25 THIS TERM USED REPEATEDLY BY THE STATE IS OF GREAT  
26 IMPORTANCE, AS IT SHOWS, OR RATHER GOES TO PROVE THAT NOT  
27 EVEN THE STATE IS CONFIDENT THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY

28

1 OF THESE CRIMES.

2 IN WEBSTERS NEW UNIVERSAL UNABRIDGED DICTIONARY (PG 55) THE  
3 DEFINITION OF ALLEGED IS "1) DECLARED OR ASSERTED, OR STATED AS  
4 DESCRIBED; "THE ALLEGED MURDERER IS INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY,"  
5 2) DOUBTFUL; SUSPECT; SUPPOSED."

6 PRIOR TO AN OBTAINING OF A CONVICTION, WHEN DESCRIBING A  
7 'SUSPECTS' CULPABILITY IN A CRIME, HE IS ALLEGED TO HAVE  
8 COMMITTED THE CRIME. AN ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE TO CONTINUALLY  
9 USE A TERM THAT GOES TO SHOW THAT THEY HAVE DOUBTS AND UNCERTAIN  
10 OR NOT CONFIDENT IN THE OUTCOME OF THIS CASE, THEN WITH THIS  
11 DEFENDANT'S 'COLLECTION' OF MOTIONS TO WITHDRAW HIS GUILTY PLEA  
12 THEY MUST BE GRANTED IN ITS ENTIRETY.

13 THE COURTS HAS THE AUTHORITY TO WITHDRAW A GUILTY PLEA  
14 FOR A FAIR AND JUST REASON; A MANIFEST INJUSTICE. THE STATE  
15 INTENTIONALLY SHOWING THAT NOT EVEN THEY ARE CONFIDENT IS  
16 A HUGE FACTOR. IT CAN NOT BE ARGUED THAT THIS WAS A SIMPLE  
17 CLERICAL ERROR, IT GOES TO THE DIRECT MINDSET OF ITS AUTHOR,  
18 GARY HATLESTAD. HE DOES NOT BECOME THE CHIEF APPELLATE DEPUTY  
19 AND NOT KNOW WHEN TO USE THE TERM ALLEGED. NOT IN A POST-  
20 CONVICTION MOTION, ESPECIALLY IF SUCH A CONVICTION IS BASED UPON  
21 A GUILTY PLEA. THE ONLY OBVIOUS REASON FOR AN EXPERIENCED  
22 PROSECUTOR TO USE SUCH TERMINOLOGY, IS THAT HE IS IN DOUBT, AND  
23 AS SUCH THE MOTION SHOULD BE GRANTED, AND THE CONVICTION  
24 CAN NOT STAND.

25

### CONCLUSION

26 ALL OF THE INFORMATION BROUGHT FOWARD IN ALL THE  
27 ABOVE-MENTIONED MOTIONS HAVE NOT ONLY ESTABLISHED BUT PROVEN

28

③

1 A MANIFEST INJUSTICE HAS OCCURED, AS WELL AS INEFFECTIVE  
 2 ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, INVOLUNTARY PLEA, UNKNOWING ENTRANCE,  
 3 VIOLATION OF THE PLEA AGREEMENT BY THE STATE, FRAUD, FRAUDULENT  
 4 INDUCEMENT, MUTUAL MISTAKE OF LAW, SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH, ILLEGAL  
 5 CONTRACT IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION TO A STATE LEGISLATIVE STATUTE,  
 6 INTENTIONAL MISSTATEMENT OF FACTS, MISINTERPETATION OF LAW,  
 7 MATERIAL MISSTATEMENTS, MUTUAL MISTAKE OF FACTS, IGNORANCE ABOUT  
 8 CORRECT LAW, INTENTIONAL VIOLATION OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALINGS,  
 9 CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS WHEN A DUTY EXISTS REQUIRING THEIR  
 10 DISCLOSURE, VIOLATION (INTENTIONAL) OF DUE PROCESS, VIOLATION OF THE 'SPIRIT'  
 11 AND 'INTENT' OF CONTRACT, GENERATING A CONTRACT UNDER FALSE PRETENSE,  
 12 WITH THE INTENT TO DEFRAUD, AND FINALLY FRAUD ON THE COURT.

13 IN THE INTREST OF JUSTICE, THIS DEFENDANT HUMBLY REQUESTS AND  
 14 PRAYS FOR THE FOLLOWING RELIEF IN CASE - CR07-1728 AND CR07P1728:

- 15 1) GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM DATED MARCH 6, 2008, BE WITHDRAWN;
- 16 2) CONVICTION RENDERED ON AUGUST 5, 2008 BE SET ASIDE AND VACATED;
- 17 3) ORDER OF CONVICTION FILED ON AUGUST 11, 2008 BE VACATED;
- 18 4) DEFENDANT BE RETURNED TO THE 'STATE' HE FOUND HIMSELF PRIOR  
 19 TO THE ENTRANCE OF GUILTY PLEA ON MARCH 6, 2008, NOT GUILTY;
- 20 5) ANY AND ALL STATEMENTS, REPORTS OR REFERANCE TO DOCUMENTS  
 21 GENERATED AS A RESULT OF GUILTY PLEA, BE DEEMED INADMISSABLE;
- 22 6) THE STATE RETAIN THE BURDEN OF PROOF TO THE GUILT OF THE  
 23 DEFENDANT, BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT;
- 24 7) ANY AND ALL REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTRATION AS A DIRECT  
 25 RESULT OF THE CONVICTION BE COMPLETELY VACATED;
- 26 8) AN ORDER TO RELEASE 'PRISONER' / DEFENDANT FROM THE  
 27 CUSTODY OF THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS IMMEDIATELY

1 UPON THE ORDER GRANTING THIS MOTION;  
2 9) AN ORDER TO APPOINT COUNSEL TO REPRESENT DEFENDANT IN  
3 UPCOMING CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS; OR TO APPOINT CURRENT POST-  
4 CONVICTION COUNSEL TO OFFICIALLY REPRESENT DEFENDANT;  
5 10) ORDER GRANTING A NEW TRIAL PROCEEDING, AND IF CONVICTED A  
6 NEW SENTENCING HEARING;

7 IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE RELIEF, THIS DEFENDANT ASKS THE COURT  
8 TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL RELIEF, IN THE FACT  
9 THAT THE CONDUCT OF ALL ATTORNEYS INVOLVED IN THE GENERATING  
10 AND PRESENTATION OF THIS 'CONTRACT' WAS SO EGREGIOUS, SO  
11 AS TO SHOCK THE CONSCIENCE, THE DEFENDANT PRAYS FOR  
12 CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING:

13 11) DISMISSAL OF ALL CHARGES ON THE BASIS OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE,  
14 FACTUAL IMPOSSIBILITY TO HAVE COMMITTED AS ALLEGED, PROSECUTORIAL  
15 MISCONDUCT, CONFLICT OF EVIDENCE 'INTREST' (DAVID O'MARA), THE  
16 SUPPRESSION OF MATERIALLY EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE, FRAUD, WITH  
17 PREJUDICE; (UPON ORDER GRANTING MOTION)

18 12) DISMISSAL OF COUNT I ON THE BASIS THE STATE LACKED THE SUB-  
19 JECT MATTER JURISDICTION, AS STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS, HAD RUN ITS  
20 COURSE; (UPON ORDER GRANTING MOTION) WITH PREJUDICE;

21 13) DISMISSAL OF COUNT I ON BASIS OF SUBSTANTIAL ALIBI  
22 DOCUMENTATIONS, PROVING IT IMPOSSIBLE TO COMMIT AS THE  
23 STATE ALLEGED, WITH PREJUDICE; (UPON ORDER GRANTING MOTION)

24 14) DISMISSAL OF COUNT II ON BASIS THAT THE 'ATTACK' WAS  
25 A SPECIFIC ALLEGATION, ONE WHICH IS DISPROVEN TO HAVE  
26 BEEN DONE BY THE DEFENDANT, BY R.P.D. REPORTS, PHOTOS  
27 AND WITHHELD DNA REPORT, WITH PREJUDICE; (UPON ORDER

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

ORDER GRANTING MOTION)

IS) ANY AND ALL OTHER RELIEF THIS COURT DEEMS NECESSARY TO  
GRANT IN THE INTREST OF JUSTICE.

SUBMITTED THIS 8<sup>th</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2010

Brendan Dunckley

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236

NORTHERN NEVADA CORRECTIONAL CENTER

P.O. BOX 7000

CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

DEFENDANT IN PRO SE

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

THE UNDERSIGNED DOES HEREBY AFFIRM THAT THE PRECEEDING DOCUMENT DOES  
NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER OF ANY PERSON.

DATED ON: NOVEMBER 8, 2010

Brendan Dunckley

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236

DEFENDANT IN PRO SE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1 I DO CERTIFY THAT I MAILED A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE  
2 PRECEEDING DOCUMENT, TO THE BELOW ADDRESSES ON THE 8<sup>TH</sup> DAY  
3 OF NOVEMBER, 2010, BY PLACING SAME INTO THE HANDS OF PRISON  
4 STAFF FOR POSTING IN THE U.S. MAIL, PURSUANT TO NRCP 5 (b):  
5

6  
7 WASHOE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY CLERK OF THE COURTS  
8 % GARY HATLESDO SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
9 P.O. Box 30083 % DEPT 4  
10 RENO, NEVADA 89520-3083 P.O. Box 30083  
11 RENO, NEVADA 89520-3083

12 GARY HATLESDO - CHIEF APPELLATE DEPUTY

13  
14 ROBERT W. STORY, ESQ.  
15 245 EAST LIBERTY STREET  
16 SUITE 530  
17 RENO, NEVADA 89501

18  
19 Brendan Dunchley

20  
21 BRENDAN DUNCLEY #1023236  
22 N.N.C.C.  
23 P.O. Box 7000  
24 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

25  
26 DEFENDANT IN PRO PER  
27

FILED

2479

10 DEC 30 AM 11:20

HOWARD W. CONYERS

BY Clark  
DEPUTY

1 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236

2 N.N.C.C.

3 P.O. Box 7000

4 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

5

6 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF

7 NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

8

9 THE STATE OF NEVADA,

10 PLAINTIFF,

CASE NO: CR07-1728

11 VS

DEPT. NO: 4

12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

13 DEFENDANT.

14

15 MOTION TO STRIKE STATE'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S

16 MOTION(S) TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM

17 & MOTION FOR SUBMISSION OF DECISION.

18 THIS DEFENDANT, BRANDAN DUNCKLEY, BRINGS FORWARD THE ABOVE-

19 MENTIONED MOTION TO THIS HONORABLE COURT, IN DIRECT REFERENCE

20 TO THE "OPPOSITION" FILED ON, OCTOBER 21, 2010. THIS MOTION IS

21 BASED ON THE ACCOMPANYING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.

22 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

23 THE STATE'S ENTIRE ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE WITHDRAWAL

24 OF DEFENDANT'S GUILTY PLEA WAS BASED UPON THE CITATION OF

25 LITTLE V. WARDEN, 117 NEV. 845, 849-51, 34 P.3d 540 (2001). SPECIFIC

26 SECTION THE RESPECTFUL GARY HATLESTAD STATED WAS "... WHEREIN

27 THE COURT OVERRULED PRIOR CASE LAW TO THE EXTENT THAT IT HELD

28

CR07-1728  
STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY ( 6 Pages  
District Court 12/30/2010 11:20 AM  
Washoe County  
2475  
VNS

1 THAT THE DISTRICT COURT'S LACK OF ADVISEMENT ON THE RECORD  
2 ABOUT NONPROBATIONABLE CHARGES IS PER SE MANIFEST ERROR.

3 BUT THE ACTUAL DECISION SAYS: "AFTER ALL, INELIGIBILITY OF  
4 PROBATION MEANS INCARCERATION, IT MEANS THAT THERE IS NOT EVEN  
5 A REMOTE POSSIBILITY THAT THE DISTRICT COURT WILL EXERCISE ITS  
6 DISCRETION AND SUSPEND THE EXECUTION OF SENTENCE. THE LOSS OF  
7 THE POSSIBILITY OF PROBATION THEREFORE BECOMES AN INSEPERABLE  
8 INGREDIENT OF THE PUNISHMENT IMPOSED. IT'S EFFECT IS SO POWERFUL  
9 THAT IT TRANSLATES THE TERM IMPOSED BY THE SENTENCING JUDGE  
10 INTO A MANDATE OF ACTUAL IMPRISONMENT." (ID 846)

11 THE STATES CONTENTION ALBET ERRONEOUS IS THAT FOR  
12 NRS 201.230 ALLOWED FOR PROBATION BETWEEN "COUNT 1 ALLEGED  
13 THAT DUNCKLEY COMMITTED THE CRIME OF LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD  
14 UNDER THE AGE OF FOURTEEN BETWEEN AUGUST 1998 AND AUGUST 2000.  
15 DUNCKLEY CONTENDS THAT PROBATION WAS NOT AVAILABLE FOR THIS  
16 OFFENSE DURING ALL OR PART OF THAT TIME FRAME. WE DISAGREE."  
17 (STATE'S OPPOSITION PAGE 2; 7-9)

18 WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, FIRST AND FORMOST, THE 'ALLEGED  
19 VICTIM' ASHLEY, 'CLOSED' THE WINDOW OF OFFENSE ON JULY 2, 2007,  
20 TO AUGUST 14, 1998 TO AUGUST 13, 1998. SECOND THE SACRED TITLE  
21 OF PROSECUTOR IS ATTACHED TO THE NECESSITY TO FULLY KNOW,  
22 UNDERSTAND AND INTERPET THE LAWS CORRECTLY, NOT ONLY HOW  
23 THEY FEEL IT SHOULD BE VIEWED TO FIT THEIR END RESULTS. IN  
24 1997 STATUTES OF NEVADA, CHAPTER 524, PAGE 2502, 2503 THE STATE  
25 LEGISLATORS DECIDED THAT PROBATION WOULD NO LONGER BE  
26 AVAILABLE FOR LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD. (NRS 201.230) EFFECTIVE  
27 OCTOBER 1, 1997. SO PROBATION BY VIOLATION OF NRS 201.230 WAS NOT



1 AVAILABLE, AND NO "SECONDARY," "GENERAL" STATUTE, IE: NRS 176A.100;  
 2 176A.110 CAN OVERRIDE THE PRIMARY CRIMINAL STATUTE, CHARGED  
 3 WITH VIOLATING.

4 AS A SIDE NOTE, STRICTLY FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW, IF NRS  
 5 200.366 HAS A SENTENCE OF LIFE WITH PAROLE (VARIOUS) AND  
 6 IN NRS 193.330 A VIOLATION TO ATTEMPT TO COMMIT A CATEGORY  
 7 'A' FELONY (200.366) IS PUNISHABLE ONLY BY A SENTENCE ACCORDING  
 8 TO A CATEGORY 'B' (2 TO 20). NOWHERE IN EITHER CRIMINAL  
 9 STATUTE DOES THE LEGISLATURE MENTION PROBATION AS A VIABLE  
 10 SENTENCING OPTION AVAILABLE. SO HOW CAN A 'GENERAL STATUTE'  
 11 LIKE NRS 176A.110, WHICH IS NOTHING MORE THAN A LIST, CHANGE,  
 12 ALTER, THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT?

13 ALL THIS DEFENDANT'S MOVING PAPERS HAVE ATTACKED THE  
 14 GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM, UNDER CONTRACT LAW STANDARDS, IN  
 15 OVER A DOZEN DIFFERENT DIRECTIONS. ALL POINTING TO THE DIRE  
 16 CONSTITUTIONAL NECESSITY TO GRANT THIS DEFENDANT'S REQUESTS.  
 17 TRUE PROBATION AVAILABILITY WAS ONE OF THE GROUNDS OF ATTACK, ONE  
 18 THAT WAS STRONGLY SUPPORTED WITH 112 DIFFERENT MENTIONS OF ITS  
 19 AVAILABILITY, THE LAW SHOWING ITS DELETION FROM THE ACTUAL STATUTE  
 20 INCLUDED IN THE "CONTRACT." SECOND MOTION ON MARCH 4, 2010 GAVE  
 21 THE 'COPY' OF NRS 201.230 HISTORICAL AND STATUTORY NOTES, IN SEPT-  
 22 EMBER, A SUBMISSION WAS FILED, STILL NO ANSWER FROM THE STATE  
 23 SEVEN (7) MONTHS. ON DIRECT OPPOSITION TO THE STATES "ARGUMENT"  
 24 THIS DEFENDANT PROVED, ESTABLISHED, BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT:  
 25 MUTUAL MISTAKE (CJS §150); MATERIAL MISSTATEMENT (§156); ILLEGALITY  
 26 OF CONTRACT IN CONTRAST TO STATUTE (§ 208); SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH (§  
 27 161) BY ADA VILORIA AND DAVID C. O'MARA; MUTUAL MISTAKE OF FACT AND

1 LAW; FRAUDULENT INDUCEMENT; INTENTIONAL VIOLATION OF GOOD  
 2 FAITH AND FAIR DEALING (NRS. 104.1203); INTENTIONAL FRAUD ON THE  
 3 COURT; MISREPRESENTATION OF FACTS; MISSTATEMENTS OF FACTS;  
 4 SUPPRESSION OF MATERIAL FACTS; FRAUD; BREACH BY STATE IN  
 5 VIOLATION OF SPIRIT OF AGREEMENT; IN ADDITION THE MOTIONS  
 6 WERE SUPPORTED BY OVER 100 VALID RELEVANT CASE CITATIONS AND  
 7 AUTHORITY, STATE V. HABERSTROH, 119 NEV. 173, 187 (2003)

8 THE STATE HAS HAD JUST SHY OF 200 DAYS TO ARGUE  
 9 IN OPPOSITION, AND SUPPORT SUCH WITH RELEVANT AUTHORITY AND  
 10 FAILED TO DO SUCH. NRAP 31 (C) 'ANY OPPOSITION RESPONDANT (STATE)  
 11 HAS TO APPELLANTS (DEFENDANT) POSITION ON THIS ISSUE MUST BE  
 12 SUPPORTED WITH RELEVANT AUTHORITY.' THE ONLY AUTHORITY THE STATE  
 13 USED WAS LITTLE V. WARDEN, AND MISINTERPETED IT, AND USED IT IN  
 14 EXACT OPPOSITE INTENTION/RELATION TO THE PRESENT CASE, BEFORE  
 15 THIS COURT.

16 "WHERE A PARTY ALLOWS AN ISSUE TO STAND UNCHALLENGED,  
 17 THIS COURT MAY INFER A CONCESSION THAT THE ARGUMENT  
 18 HAS MERIT" COLTON V. MURPHY, 71 NEV. 71, 72 (1955)

### 19 CONCLUSION

20 SO IN THE INTREST OF JUSTICE, SINCE THE STATES ONLY  
 21 ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION WAS AN ACTUAL MISTAKEN INTERPETATION  
 22 OF LITTLE V. WARDEN, AND ITS FAILURE TO ANSWER ANY OF THE  
 23 OTHER ISSUES, NOR TO INTERPETATE NRS 201.230 (1997 LAWS)  
 24 CORRECTLY, THIS MOTION IS SUBMITTED.

25 TO STRIKE THE STATES FRIVOLOUS OPPOSITION, ON GROUNDS IT  
 26 FAILED TO ADEQUATLY CHALLENGE THE ENTIRETY OF THE DEFENDANT'S  
 27 MOVING PAPERS.

1 SO WITH THERE BEING NO VALID ARGUMENT AS TO WHY  
2 THIS DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS SHOULD BE DENIED, AND THE STATE'S  
3 FAILURE TO AFFIRMATIVELY OR CORRECTLY COMPLETELY OBJECT, THERE  
4 IS GOOD FAITH REASON TO GRANT ALL MOVING PAPERS BY THIS  
5 DEFENDANT BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT IN THEIR ENTIRETY.

6 SINCE, A DELAY UNTIL THE SCHEDULED EVIDENTIARY HEARING  
7 ON APRIL 1, 2011, WOULD BE A SERIOUS MISCARRAGE OF JUSTICE. AS  
8 THE MOVING PAPERS MORE THAN ESTABLISH AND PROVE A GROSS  
9 MANIFEST INJUSTICE, HAS INDEED OCCURED, BUT IT IS MORE LIKELY  
10 THAN NOT AN INNOCENT MAN IS CURRENTLY INCARCERATED, ONE  
11 WHO HAS PRESENTED MORE THAN ADEQUATE REASONS TO TAKE  
12 ACTION. A DELAY WILL BE A UNCONSCIONABLE ~~ERRONEOUS~~ ERROR  
13 THAT CAN NOT BE ALLOWED TO GO UNCORRECTED.

14 THE COURTS HAVE RULED REPEATEDLY THAT ANY DOUBT  
15 AS TO THE VALIDITY MUST BE RULED IN FAVOR OF THE DEFENDANT  
16 AND WITHDRAW FROM "CONTRACT." "JUSTICE DELAYED IS CLEARLY  
17 JUSTICE DENIED" DOUGAN V. GUSTAVENSON, 108 NEV. 517, 837 P.2d 795, 799  
18 (NEV. 2992)

19 THIS DEFENDANT HUMBLY REQUESTS A SPEEDY DECISION IN  
20 THIS MATTER, TO BE RENDERED IN A TIMELY MANNER, AS THIS  
21 "ISSUE" HAS BEEN BEFORE THIS COURT FOR TEN (10) MONTHS.  
22 ALL THIS DEFENDANT IS ASKING THIS COURT, IS TO GRANT THE  
23 RELIEF SOUGHT, IN THE LEAST GRANT THE WITHDRAWAL OF  
24 GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM, TO ALLOW HIM TO FIGHT THE  
25 ALLEGATIONS LEVED AGAINST HIM AND HAVE HIS DAY  
26 IN COURT, TO PROVE HIS INNOCENCE TO ALL THESE CRIMINAL  
27 CHARGES.

1 SUBMITTED TO THIS HONORABLE COURT ON 20<sup>th</sup>, DECEMBER, 2010

2  
3 Brendan Dunchley

4 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236

5 N.N.C.C.

6 P.O. BOX 7000

7 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

8 DEFENDANT IN PRO PER

9  
10 AFFIRMATION IN PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

11 THE UNDERSIGNED DOES AFFIRM THAT THE ABOVE DOCUMENT IN  
12 CRO7-1728 DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER OF ANY  
13 PERSON

14 DATED 20<sup>th</sup>, DECEMBER, 2010

Brendan Dunchley

15 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236

16 DEFENDANT IN PRO PER

17 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

18 I DO CERTIFY THAT I MAILED A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ABOVE  
19 ENTITLED MOTION, TO THE BELOW ADDRESSES ON THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF DECEMBER,  
20 2010. BY PLACING SAME INTO THE U.S. MAIL VIA PRISON LAW LIBRARY STAFF  
21 PURSUANT TO NRCP 5(b):

22 CLERK OF THE COURTS  
23 SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
P.O. BOX 30083  
24 RENO, NEVADA 89520-3083

W.C.D.A.  
% G. HATLESTAD  
P.O. BOX 30083  
RENO, NEVADA  
89520-3083

ROBERT STORY, ESQ.  
STORY LAW GROUP  
245 E. LIBERTY ST., SUITE 530  
RENO, NEVADA  
89501

25  
26 DEFENDANT IN PRO PER

Brendan Dunchley

27 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236

1 CODE #2645  
RICHARD A. GAMMICK  
2 #001510  
P. O. Box 30083  
3 Reno, Nevada 89520-3083  
(775)328-3200  
4 Attorney for Plaintiff

5  
6 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
7 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

8 \* \* \*

9 THE STATE OF NEVADA,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

Case No. CR07-1728

12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

Dept. No. 4

13 Defendant.  
14 \_\_\_\_\_/

15 OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO STRIKE STATE'S OPPOSITION TO  
16 MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND SUPPLEMENT IN  
CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA

17 Comes now, the State of Nevada, by and through counsel, to submit this Opposition to  
18 Dunckley's Motion to Strike State's Opposition to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and  
19 Supplement in Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. This Opposition is based on  
20 the accompanying discussion.

21 DISCUSSION

22 Although titled a Motion to Strike, Dunckley's argument sounds more like a Reply to our  
23 previously filed Opposition to his Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. Moreover, aside from  
24 taking a few predicable potshots at the State's Opposition, Dunckley has cited no reason to  
25 strike our Opposition, nor has he cited case law supporting it.

26 In short, the Court should treat Dunckley's Motion for what it is: a Reply. Accordingly,

1 Dunckley's Motion should be denied.

2 AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

3 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the  
4 social security number of any person.

5 DATED: January 3, 2011.

6 RICHARD A. GAMMICK  
7 District Attorney

8 By /s/ GARY H. HATLESTAD  
9 GARY H. HATLESTAD  
10 Chief Appellate Deputy

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Washoe County District Attorney's Office and that, on January 3, 2011, I deposited for mailing through the U.S. Mail Service at Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, postage prepaid, a true copy of the foregoing document, addressed to:

Brendan Dunckley #1023236  
Northern Nevada Correctional Center  
P.O. Box 7000  
Carson City, NV 89702

Robert W. Story, Esq.  
245 E. Liberty Street, Suite 530  
Reno, NV 89501

/s/ SHELLY MUCKEL  
SHELLY MUCKEL

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\*  
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 01-03-2011:11:01:36  
**Clerk Accepted:** 01-03-2011:11:06:30  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Opposition to Mtn  
**Filed By:** GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ.

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY



1 **CODE 3347**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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

**THE STATE OF NEVADA,**

**Plaintiff,**

**Case No. CR07-1728**

**vs.**

**Dept. No. 4**

**BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,**

**Defendant.**

---

**ORDER**

On March 3, 2010, the Defendant filed a Motion for Withdrawal of Guilty Plea. On March 4, 2010, the Defendant filed a Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On April 23, 2010, this Court entered an Order staying Decision on the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea until outcome of the Defendant's appeal to the Nevada Supreme Court. On July 14, 2010, the Defendant filed an additional Supplement in Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On September 9, 2010, the Supreme Court entered an Order of Affirmance, with the remittitur being entered on October 15, 2010. On October 15, 2010, this Court entered an Order for the State to file a Response to the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and the Supplements to the Motion. On October 21, 2010, the State filed an Opposition to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea, Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and Supplement in Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On November 3, 2010, the Defendant filed a Response to State's Opposition to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea, Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and Supplement in

1 Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On November 17, 2010, the Defendant  
2 formally submitted the Motion and its Supplements to the Court for decision.

3 The Court, having reviewed the pleadings filed herein, with good cause  
4 appearing and in the interests of justice finds as follows:

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties shall appear within fifteen (15) days from  
6 the date of this Order, before the Administrative Assistant in Department IV, of the Second  
7 Judicial District Court for the purpose of setting oral arguments on the Motion to Withdraw  
8 Guilty Plea, Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and Supplement in  
9 Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea.

10 Dated this 31 day of December, 2010.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

*Connie J. Steinheimer*  
DISTRICT JUDGE


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of the SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of the STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE; that on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2010, I electronically filed the Order with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system, which sent a notice of electronic filing to the following:

Gary Hatlestad, Esq.  
Chief Deputy District Attorney

I further certify that on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2010, I deposited in the county mailing system for postage and mailing with the U.S. Postal Service, a true copy of the same, addressed to:

Brendan Dunckley  
Inmate no. 1023236  
NNCC  
P.O. Box 7000  
Carson City, NV 89702

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marci L. Stone

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 01-07-2011:14:15:12  
**Clerk Accepted:** 01-07-2011:14:15:37  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Order to Set  
**Filed By:** Marci Trabert

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**


STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

CR07-1728  
STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY ( 7 Pages  
District Court 01/21/2011 01:57 PM  
Washoe County 2490  
cnc  
ESTIMATE

FILED

JAN 21 2011

HOWARD W. CONYERS, CLERK  
By:  DEPUTY CLERK

1 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY # 1023236  
2 N.N.C.C.  
3 P.O. Box 7000  
4 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

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

9 THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
10 PLAINTIFF, CASE No: CR07-1728  
11 vs. DEPT. No. 4

12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,  
13 DEFENDANT, / MOTION FOR SETTING OF ORAL  
14 ARGUMENTS ON MOTION(S) TO WITHDRAW PLEA

16 COMES NOW, DEFENDANT, BRENDAN DUNCKLEY, IN PRO SE, TO  
17 REQUEST THIS HONORABLE COURT TO SUBMIT THIS MOTION. THIS  
18 MOTION IS SUPPORTED BY THE FOLLOWING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES,  
19 AS IS ALL MOVING PAPERS ON FILE HEREIN.

20 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

22 ON DECEMBER 31, 2010, THIS COURT ORDERED:  
23 " THAT THE PARTIES SHALL APPEAR WITHIN FIFTEEN (15) DAYS FROM  
24 THE DATE OF THIS ORDER, BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT IN  
25 DEPARTMENT IV, OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
26 PURPOSE OF SETTING ORAL ARGUMENTS ON THE MOTION TO WITHDRAW  
27 GUILTY PLEA, SUPPLEMENTAL TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA AND

1 SUPPLEMENTAL IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY  
2 PLEA.

3 TO COMPLY WITH THIS ORDER, AND BY COUNTING FIFTEEN (15)  
4 DAYS AS FIFTEEN JUDICIAL DAYS, THE EXPIRATION DATE IS THAT  
5 OF JANUARY 24, 2011. (MON-FRI, NOT INCLUDING THE 17<sup>TH</sup> A HOLIDAY)  
6 SINCE THE COURT'S WILL NOT NORMALLY SIGN AN ORDER TO  
7 PRODUCE / TRANSPORT INMATE, FOR A CALENDERING SESSION AS  
8 THIS MOTION ADDRESSES, THIS MOTION IS FILED IN LUE OF THE  
9 DEFENDANT'S APPEARANCE.

10 THE CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DATED BOTH THE 7<sup>TH</sup> AND 10<sup>TH</sup>  
11 OF JANUARY, 2011, LIST SERVICE TO THE PARTIES INVOLVED,  
12 THAT BEING GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ, AND THE DEFENDANT. AS SUCH  
13 IT IS REQUESTED THAT NO EXPARTE COMMUNICATION COMMENCE.  
14 TO RESOLVE THIS DILEMA THE DEFENDANT REQUESTS THE COURT  
15 BY WAY OF HER ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO SCHEDULE A  
16 SPECIFIC DATE AND TIME FOR A TELECONFERENCE TO BE SET-UP.  
17 SO TO ALLOW THE DEFENDANT THE RIGHT TO ENSURE DUE  
18 PROCESS IS UPHOLD.

19 THIS SERIES OF MOTIONS HAVE BEEN BEFORE THE COURT  
20 FOR A TOTAL OF THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEEN DAYS (317). BY  
21 THE TIME THE 'FIFTEEN DAYS' EXPIRE IT WILL BE 327. ON THAT  
22 BASIS ANY FURTHER DELAY WOULD BE A CONTINUAL DELAY  
23 IN JUSTICE.

24 "JUSTICE DELAYED IS CLEARLY JUSTICE DENIED." DOUGAN V.  
25 GUSTAVENSON, 108 NEV. 517, 835 P.2d. 795, 799, (NEV. 1992)

26 ALL THE MOVING PAPERS FILED IN THIS CASE TO WITHDRAW  
27 GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM ALL POINT TO AND PROVE DUE PROCESS

1 VIOLATIONS, CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS. TO BE SPECIFIC ONE AREA  
2 IS CJS 17A §161 IN THE SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH. "SUPPRESSION OF  
3 TRUTH BY ONE OR TWO PARTIES TO A CONTRACT IS AS AFFIRMATIVE  
4 A FRAUD AS A FALSE STATEMENT OF FACT SINCE IT PREVENTS  
5 THE MINDS OF THE PARTIES FROM MEETING ON THE ACTUAL  
6 TERMS OF THEIR CONTRACT" MORRIS V. MCGOUGH, 230 S.W. 1092.

7 THE RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS REFER TO THE  
8 INTENTIONAL WITHHOLDING OF MATERIAL EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE,  
9 AS IS THE CASE HERE BEFORE THE COURT, AS A SERIOUS  
10 CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS.

11 THE COURTS HAVE RULED REPEATEDLY THAT THE PROCESS OF  
12 PLEADING GUILTY TO A CRIMINAL CHARGE INVOLVES A WAIVER OF NUMEROUS  
13 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. ANY ERRORS OR CLAIMS OF VIOLATIONS IN THE  
14 PROCESS THAT MAY HAVE INDUCED A DEFENDANT TO GIVE UP HIS  
15 CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS, MUST BE CORRECTED IN A TIMELY  
16 MANNER. (STATE V. HUMPHREY, 194 P.3d 643, 346 MONT. 150 (2008), STATE V.  
17 FOSTER, 108 P.3d 1074, 39 KAN. APP. 2d 380 (2008) & US V. PRESSER, 844 F.2d 1275)

18 NRS 176.165 ALLOWS THE WITHDRAWAL OF A GUILTY PLEA AFTER  
19 SENTENCING TO CORRECT A MANIFEST INJUSTICE, THE SIXTH AND  
20 FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS ALL REQUIRE THE SPEEDY REMEDY OF  
21 RELIEF IF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ARE BEING HINDERED. (USCA III & XIV)

22 SINCE THE DEFENDANT HAS SHOWN BY WAY OF THE RECORD  
23 OVER A DOZEN SPECIFIC 'AREAS' OF CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS  
24 PERFORMED BY BOTH THE STATE AND DEFENDANT'S FORMER COUNSEL  
25 DAVID C. O'MARA, AND THE STATE HAS RESPONDED TO ONLY ONE 'AVENUE',  
26 THEIR SILENCE AND FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THE DOZEN OTHER 'AREAS' SHOULD BE  
27 VIEWED AS AN ADMISSION THEY HAVE MERIT AND ARE NOT DISPUTED. (KRESSMAN

1 V. SHANGLE, 92 NEV. 216, 548 P.2d 691 (NEV. 1976), FRAZIER V US, 18 F.3d  
2 788, AVERY V. ALABAMA, 60 US. S. CT. 321, 322, 308 US 444, 447)

3 CONCLUSION

4  
5 ON MARCH 3, 2011 THIS MOTION WILL HAVE BEEN  
6 BEFORE THE COURT FOR ONE YEAR. SINCE A REVIEW OF THE  
7 PLEADINGS FILED HEREIN HAVE SHOWN GOOD CAUSE AND IN THE  
8 INTERESTS OF JUSTICE THE DEFENDANT WISHES TO EXERCISE HIS  
9 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A SPEEDY PROCEEDING. AMENDMENTS  
10 VI AND XIV WERE DESIGNED TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF A  
11 CITIZEN IN A CRIMINAL MATTER, AND THOSE RIGHTS DO NOT  
12 CEASE TO BE PROTECTED UPON A CONVICTION COMMENCING  
13 ESPECIALLY IF THERE IS STRONG PROOF BY WAY OF EVIDENCE THAT  
14 SUCH A CONVICTION IS BASED UPON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS  
15 VIOLATIONS.

16 SO IN THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE, AND AS IS THIS  
17 DEFENDANT'S CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHT TO A SPEEDY  
18 PROCEEDING, IT IS REQUESTED THAT THE ORAL ARGUMENTS FOR  
19 THIS INSTANT MOTION AND ALL CONNECTED PLEADINGS, FILES AND  
20 MOVING PAPERS FILED FROM MARCH 3, 2010 TO PRESENT, IN THE  
21 ATTEMPT TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA, TO BE SCHEDULED AT A  
22 DATE AND TIME NOT TO PASS MARCH 3, 2011.

23 IT IS ALSO RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED THAT THIS COURT  
24 ORDER THE FOLLOWING:

25 1) AN ORDER TO PRODUCE DEFENDANT, TO BE SERVED,  
26 UPON THE NDOC BY WAY OF THE WARDEN OF N.N.C.C.

27 2) GRANTING THE DEFENDANT IN PRO SE ALL RIGHTS



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

RESERVED AS COUNSEL, TO PRESENT ORAL ARGUMENTS BEFORE  
THIS HONORABLE COURT, AS DEFENDANT FILED THESE MOTIONS  
IN PRO PER;

3) NAME ATTORNEY ROBERT STORY AS CO-COUNSEL,  
STAND-BY TO INSURE TRIAL COURT PROCEDURES AND  
PRACTICES ARE FOLLOWED;

4) SCHEDULE OF ORAL ARGUMENTS TO BE HEARD,  
NO LATER THAN MARCH 3, 2011,

5) ANY OTHER 'ORDER' THIS COURT DEEMS  
NECESSARY TO GRANT IN THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE.

DATED THIS 12<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2011

Brendan Dunchley

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236

N.N.C.C.

P.O. Box 7000

CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

DEFENDANT IN PRO SE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**AFFIRMATION**  
Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document, \_\_\_\_\_

MOTION FOR SETTING OF ORAL ARGUMENTS ON

MOTION TO WITHDRAW PLEA

(Title of Document)

filed in case number: CR07-1728

Document does not contain the social security number of any person

-OR-

Document contains the social security number of a person as required by:

A specific state or federal law, to wit:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(State specific state or federal law)

-or-

For the administration of a public program

-or-

For an application for a federal or state grant

-or-

Confidential Family Court Information Sheet  
(NRS 125.130, NRS 125.230 and NRS 125B.055)

Date: 11/13/11

Brendan Dunchly  
(Signature)

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236  
(Print Name)

ATT. DEF. PRO PER.  
(Attorney for)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

Pursuant to N.R.C.P. Rule 5 (b), I hereby certify that I am the Petitioner/Defendant named herein and that on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of JANUARY 2011, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to the following:

WASHOE COUNTY D.A.

PO BOX 30083

RENO NEVADA 89520

Clerk of the Court

Second Judicial District

P.O. Box 30083

RENO NEVADA

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Brendan Dunchly # 1023236

DEFENDANT IN PRO PER

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

CODE 1250

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

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. CR07-1728

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

Dept. No. 4

Defendant.

**APPLICATION FOR SETTING**

TYPE OF ACTION: Post-Conviction

MATTER TO BE HEARD: Motion for Withdrawal of Guilty Plea - Oral Argument

Date of Application : 1/21/11 Made by: Plaintiff

Plaintiff or Defendant

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF: Gary H. Hatlestad, WCDA, POB 30083, Reno, NV 89520

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT: Pro Per, #1023236, NNCC, POB 7000, Carson City, NV 89702

Instructions: Check the appropriate box. Indicate who is requesting the jury. Estimated No. Of Jurors:

Jury Demanded by (Name): \_\_\_\_\_

No Jury Demanded by (Name): \_\_\_\_\_

Estimated Duration of Trial: \_\_\_\_\_

Via telephone \_\_\_\_\_

Incarcerated \_\_\_\_\_

Gary H. Hatlestad

Brendan Dunckley #1023236

Attorney(s) for Plaintiff

Attorney(s) for Defendant

Oral Arguments 9:00A

22<sup>nd</sup>

April

2011

Motion No. \_\_\_\_\_ Setting at \_\_\_\_\_

on the \_\_\_\_\_

day of \_\_\_\_\_

20

Trial - No. \_\_\_\_\_ Setting at \_\_\_\_\_

on the \_\_\_\_\_

day of \_\_\_\_\_

20

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

CASE NO. CR07-1728

I certify that I am an employee of the SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of the STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE; that on the 24 day of January, 2011, I electronically filed the **APPLICATION FOR SETTING** with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system.

I further certify that I transmitted a true and correct copy of the foregoing document by the method(s) noted below:


**Personal delivery to the following: [NONE]**

**Electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following:**

- ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN DUNCKLEY
- KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA
- GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

**Deposited in the Washoe County mailing system for postage and mailing with the United States Postal Service in Reno, Nevada:**

Brendan Dunckley  
Inmate No. 1023236  
NNCC  
P.O. Box 7000  
Carson City, NV 89702

  
Audrey A. Kay

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\*  
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 01-24-2011:14:44:52  
**Clerk Accepted:** 01-24-2011:14:46:07  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Application for Setting - eFile  
**Filed By:** Audrey Kay

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1250

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

STATE OF NEVADA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
vs.  
  
BRENDAN DUNKLEY,  
  
Defendant.

CASE NO.: CR07-1728  
DEPT. NO.: 4

---

BRENDAN DUNKLEY,  
  
Petitioner,  
  
vs.  
  
STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,  
  
Respondents.

CASE NO.: CR07P1728  
DEPT. NO.: 4

**APPLICATION FOR SETTING**

TYPE OF ACTION:  
MATTER TO BE HEARD:

CRIMINAL  
MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY  
PLEA – ORAL ARGUMENTS  
and  
EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON PETITION FOR  
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS  
(POST-CONVICTION)

DATE OF APPLICATION:  
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF:  
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT:  
PRO PER DEFENDANT:

March 11, 2011  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ.  
ROBERT STORY, ESQ.  
BRENDAN DUNKLEY

Setting at **9:00 p.m.** on the **3<sup>rd</sup>** day of June, 2011  
**\*\*\*VACATES APRIL 22, 2011 HEARING\*\*\***

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

CASE NO. CR07-01728 & CR07P1728

I certify that I am an employee of the SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of the STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE; that on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2011, I electronically filed the **APPLICATION FOR SETTING** with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system.

I further certify that I transmitted a true and correct copy of the foregoing document by the method(s) noted below:

**Personal delivery to the following: [NONE]**

**Electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following:**


GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

**Deposited in the Washoe County mailing system for postage and mailing with the United States Postal Service in Reno, Nevada:**

Brendan Dunkley, #1023236  
NNCC  
P.O. Box 7000  
Carson City, NV 89702

  
Audrey A. Kay



**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 03-11-2011:13:13:07  
**Clerk Accepted:** 03-11-2011:13:13:57  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Application for Setting - eFile  
**Filed By:** Audrey Kay

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

DC-9900024461-026  
CR07-1728 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY ( 8 Pages  
STATE VS BRENDAN DUNCKLEY ( 8 Pages  
District Court 03/18/2011 02:15 PM 2490  
Washoe County  
SSTINCHP  
ncf

1 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY # 1023236

2 N.N.C.C.

3 P.O. Box 7000

4 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

FILED

2011 MAR 18 PM 2:15

HOWARD J. CONYERS

BY  CLERK

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

9 THE STATE OF NEVADA,

10 PLAINTIFF,

CASE NO.: CR07-1728

11 v.

DEPT. NO.: 4

12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

13 DEFENDANT,

15 MOTION FOR DEFAULT BENCH DECISION FOR THE  
16 MOTION(S) TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA, AND SUPPLEMENTALS  
17 IN CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW PLEA

19 COMES NOW, DEFENDANT, BRENDAN DUNCKLEY AND SUBMITS  
20 THIS MOTION TO THIS HONORABLE COURT.

21 THIS MOTION IS MADE BASED ON THE COURT'S INHERENT  
22 AUTHORITY AND THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO WITHDRAW A GUILTY PLEA  
23 TO CORRECT A 'MANIFEST INJUSTICE', UNDER NRS 176.165. ALL  
24 PAPERS, PLEADINGS AND DOCUMENTS ON FILE HEREIN; AND ALL  
25 THE FOLLOWING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.

26 //  
27 //  
28 //

## POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

1  
2 ON MARCH 3, 2010 A MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA WAS  
3 FILED, FOLLOWED BY SUPPLEMENTALS FILED ON MARCH 4, 2010, JULY  
4 14, 2010, NOVEMBER 3, 2010 AND NOVEMBER 17, 2010, DECEMBER 30, 2010

5 THE STATE FILED ITS OPPOSITIONS TO THE RESPECTED MOTIONS  
6 ON OCTOBER 21, 2010 AND JANUARY 3, 2011. IT IS THE OCTOBER 21ST  
7 MOTION FILED BY RICHARD GAMMICK, BY WAY OF GARY HATLESTAD,  
8 CHIEF APPELLATE DEPUTY.

9 TO BE SPECIFIC THE REASON BOTH SIDES AGREE THAT THIS  
10 DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM IS  
11 NOTED ON PAGE 2 OF THE OCTOBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2010 MOTION, LINE 2-3:

12 "IT NECESSARILY FOLLOWS THAT IF PROBATION WAS **NOT**  
13 **AVAILABLE, THE COURT SHOULD GRANT THE MOTION**"

14 (EMPHASIS ADDED)

15 SO PER MR. HATLESTAD IF PROBATION WAS NOT AVAILABLE FOR  
16 A VIOLATION OF NRS. 201.230 DURING THE WINDOW OF OFFENSE,  
17 THAT OF AUGUST 1998 AND AUGUST 1999, THE MOTION SHOULD BE  
18 GRANTED.

19 SUCH AN ARGUMENT REQUIRES THIS HONORABLE COURT TO  
20 "INTERPRET A STATUTE (201.230/176A.100/176A.110) BASED ON THEIR PLAIN  
21 MEANING WHICH IS INTENDED TO REFLECT LEGISLATIVE INTENT"  
22 WASHINGTON V. STATE, 30 P.3D 1134 (NEV. 2001) (G. HATLESTAD WAS PROSECUTOR);  
23 STATE V. QUINN, 30 P.3D 1117 (NEV. 2001); THEIS V. STATE, 30 P.3D 1140. (NEV. 2001)  
24 (ALL THREE WERE CASES OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT)

25 THE STATE'S ARGUMENT IS THAT NRS 176A.110 MAKES A VIOLATION  
26 OF NRS 201.230 IN 1998-1999 PROBATIONABLE. EXCEPT THE SUPREME  
27 COURT OF NEVADA HAS RULED ON THE 'AREA' OF CONFLICT BETWEEN  
28 STATUTE )

1 "WHEN A SPECIFIC STATUTE IS IN CONFLICT WITH A GENERAL ONE,  
 2 THE SPECIFIC STATUTE WILL TAKE PRECEDENCE" STOCKMEIER V.  
 3 NEV. DEPT OF CORR. PSYCHOLOGICAL REVIEW PANEL, 183 P.3d 134 (NEV.  
 4 2008); ANDERSON FAMILY ASSOS. V. RICCI, 179 P.3d 1201 (NEV. 2008);  
 5 SHERIFF V. WITZENBURG, 122 NEV. 1056, 145 P.3d 1002 (NEV. 2006);  
 6 LADER V WARDEN, 121 NEV. 682, 120 P.3d 1164, (NEV. 2005); GAINES V.  
 7 STATE, 116 NEV. 359, 998 P.2d 166, (NEV. 2000) "IT IS WELL RECOGNIZED  
 8 THAT SPECIFIC STATUTES TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER GENERAL STATUTES"  
 9 BUILDING & CONST. TRADES V. PUBLIC WORKS, 108 NEV. 605, 836 P.2d 633,  
 10 (NEV. 1992); SILS V. SURMAN, 103 NEV. 366, 368, 741 P.2d 1357 (NEV. 1987)  
 11 "BY THE FAMILIAR RULE OF STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION THAT WHERE  
 12 THERE IS A CONFLICT BETWEEN ONE STATUTORY PROVISION WHICH  
 13 DEALS WITH A SUBJECT IN A GENERAL WAY (NRS 176.110) AND  
 14 ANOTHER WHICH DEALS WITH THE SAME SUBJECT IN A SPECIFIC  
 15 MANNER, THE LATTER (NRS 201.230) WILL PREVAIL" KNOWLES V. HOLLY,  
 16 82 WASH. 2d 694, 513 P.2d 18, (WASH. 1973) (NRS CITED ADDED)  
 17 "EXPRESSIO UNIUS EST EXCLUSIO ALTERIUS, GIVES RISE TO AN  
 18 INFERENCE THAT ALL THINGS OR CLASSES OMITTED BY THE STATUTES  
 19 WERE INTENTIONALLY OMITTED BY THE LEGISLATURE" THE NINTH CIRCUIT  
 20 QUOTING KNOWLES IN EP. PAUP CO. V. DIR., OFFICE OF WORKERS  
 21 COMPENSATION PROGRAM, 999 F.2d 1341 (9<sup>th</sup> CIR, 1992)  
 22 "IT MUST BE PRESUMED THAT THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE, WHEN IT  
 23 ENACTS A STATUTE HAS KNOWLEDGE OF THE STATE OF THE LAW IN  
 24 REGARDS TO THE SUBJECT-MATTER INVOLVED." FUNDERBURK V. STATE, 212  
 25 P.3d 337 (NEV. -) MOST RECEIPT DECISION WAS OCTOBER 7, 2010 IN  
 26 JD. CONSTRUCTION, INC. V. JBEX INT'L GROUP, LLC, 126 NEV. ADV. REP. 36,  
 27 NCI 52543, NO. 52961, 2010 NEV. LEXUS 42, (NEV. 2010)

1 THE STATE CONTENDS THAT IF PROBATION WAS NOT AVAILABLE  
 2 THIS MOTION SHOULD BE GRANTED. SO THE ENTIRE DECISION COMES  
 3 DOWN TO HOW THE COURTS INTERPRET THE PUNISHMENT (PENALTY)  
 4 INTENDED FOR A VIOLATION OF NRS 201.230 (1997 LAWS).

5 THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CLEARLY STATED A "GUIDELINE"  
 6 TO THIS IN US V. CAMPOS-SERRANO, 404 US 293, 30 L. ED 2D 457, (19-  
 7 "THE LAW IS SETTLED THAT PENAL STATUTES ARE TO BE CONSTRUED  
 8 STRICTLY, AND THAT ONE IS NOT SUBJECT TO A PENALTY UNLESS  
 9 THE WORDS OF THE STATUTE PLAINLY IMPOSE IT." US V. TURLEY,  
 10 352 US 407, 1 L. ED 2D 430, 77 S. CT. 397 (1957) "IN CONSTRUING A  
 11 CRIMINAL STATUTE IT IS APPROPRIATE TO CONSIDER IT'S PURPOSE  
 12 AND LEGISLATIVE HISTORY." (ALSO US V. SANTOS, 533 US \_\_\_, 128 S. CT  
 13 \_\_\_, 170 L. ED 2D 912, 2008 US LEXIS 4699, (2007))

14 1997 LAWS NRS 201.230 WAS AND REMAINS A CATEGORY 'A' FELONY.  
 15 NRS 193.130 (2) CLEARLY STATES:

16 "EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY SPECIFIC STATUTE, FOR  
 17 EACH FELONY COMMITTED ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 1995:

18 (a) A CATEGORY 'A' FELONY IS A FELONY FOR WHICH A  
 19 SENTENCE OF DEATH OR IMPRISONMENT IN THE STATE PRISON FOR  
 20 LIFE WITH OR WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE MAY BE  
 21 IMPOSED, AS PROVIDED BY SPECIFIC STATUTE" (EMPHASIS ADDED)

22 "WHEN A STATUTES LANGUAGE IS PLAIN AND UNAMBIGUOUS, A COURT  
 23 SHOULD GIVE THAT LANGUAGE IT'S ORDINARY MEANING AND NOT GO  
 24 BEYOND IT." BLAINE EQUIT. CO. V. STATE, 122 NEV. 860 (NEV. 2006); NEVADA  
 25 POWER CO. V. PUC. 122 NEV. 821 (NEV. 2006); CITY OF HENDERSON V. KILGORE,  
 26 122 NEV. 331 (NEV. 2006); EVANS V. SAMUEL, 119 NEV. 378 (NEV. 2003); STATE  
 27 V. GRANITE CONST. CO., 118 NEV. 83 (NEV. 2002); US V. STATE ENG 'B', 117 NEV.  
 28 585, (NEV. 2001)

1 A FINAL STATE DECISION ON CONSTRUING A STATUTE IS. "WHERE  
2 A STATUTE IS AMENDED, PROVISIONS OF THE FORMER STATUTE OMITTED  
3 FROM THE STATUTE ARE REPEALED, (IE: PROBATION) IT IS ORDINARILY  
4 PRESUMED THAT THE LEGISLATURE, BY DELETING AN EXPRESS PORTION  
5 OF A LAW, INTENDED A SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE IN LAW "MCKAY V.  
6 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, 102 NEV. 644, 648, 730 P.2d 438 (NEV. 1986)

7 IN THIS DAY OF FISCAL CONSERVATION THE COURTS AND STATE  
8 ARE CONTINUALLY ATTEMPTING TO LIMIT RESOURCES. ORAL ARGUMENTS  
9 HAVE BEEN ORDERED IN THIS MATTER, BUT IN THE INTEREST OF  
10 JUSTICE A DECISION IS A SIMPLE ONE. ONE THAT NEEDS NO  
11 FURTHER TIME FROM THIS COURT IN REGARDS TO APPEARANCES. THE  
12 REASON IS THE NEVADA SUPREME COURT HAS ALREADY RULED ON  
13 WHAT THE COURTS INTERPRETATION OF THE PENALTY GIVEN TO VIOLATORS  
14 OF NRS 201.230 IN 1997 LAWS.

15 "IT IS NOT DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENCE  
16 BETWEEN A NON-PROBATIONAL FELONY WITH A LIFE PRISON  
17 SENTENCE AND AN ADJUDICATION OF DELINQUENCY, WITH A  
18 THREE YEAR PROBATION" SCOTT E., A MINOR, V. STATE, 931 P.2d 1370,  
19 1375 (NEV. 1997) (EMPHASIS ADDED) QUOTING CHIEF JUSTICE SHEARING'S  
20 CONCURRING OPINION.

21 AS THE SENTENCE (STATUTE, CRIME) UNDER APPEAL IN SCOTTE.  
22 WAS NRS 201.230 LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER 14 YEARS OF AGE.  
23 SO THE SUPREME COURT HAS ALREADY RULED ON THIS MATTER,  
24 AND AS SUCH, IT'S OPINION IS CLEAR. A VIOLATION OF NRS 201.230  
25 IS A 'NON-PROBATIONAL' OFFENSE WITH A 'LIFE PRISON SENTENCE.' THE  
26 COURTS INTERPRETATION IS CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS. AT NO POINT  
27 CAN PROBATION BE CONSIDERED AS A SENTENCE OPTION FOR A  
28 COURT TO CONSIDER IMPOSING FOR VIOLATORS OF NRS 201.230.

CONCLUSION

1  
2 AS THE SUPREME COURT CLEARLY RULED AND DECIDED IN  
3 SCOTT E. PROBATION WAS / IS NOT AVAILABLE. TO KEEP THE STATE  
4 TO THEIR CONTENTION " IT NECESSARILY FOLLOWS THAT IF  
5 PROBATION WAS NOT AVIALABLE, THE COURT SHOULD GRANT THE  
6 MOTION "

7 IT GOES NOW WITHOUT ARGUMENT AS TO WHY IN THE INTEREST  
8 OF JUSTICE, THE DEFENDANT'S MOVING PAPERS BE VIEWED AS  
9 MERITORIOUS, AND AWARD THE GRANTING OF HIS MOTION TO WITHDRAW  
10 HIS GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM.

11 IF THIS COURT DOES NOT DEEM IT NECESSARY TO GRANT HIS  
12 RELIEF SOUGHT IN THE NOVEMBER 17, 2010 MOTION, DEFENDANT  
13 PRAYS THIS COURT WITHDRAW PLEA, ALLOWING DEFENDANT TO RETURN  
14 TO THE STATUS OF NOT GUILTY. SINCE THIS MOTION HAS BEEN BEFORE  
15 THE COURTS NOW FOR OVER A YEAR, A SPEEDY DECISION IS  
16 REQUESTED. ALL RELIEF SOUGHT IN NOVEMBER 17, 2010 MOTION IS  
17 HEREBY PRAYED FOR.

18  
19 SUBMITTED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF MARCH, 2011

20  
21 Brendan Dunchley

22 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236

23 DEFENDANT IN PRO PER  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

Pursuant to N.R.C.P. Rule 5 (b), I hereby certify that I am the Petitioner/Defendant named herein and that on this 15<sup>th</sup> day of MARCH 2011, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to the following:

Clerk of the Court  
Second Judicial District  
P.O. Box 30083  
Reno NV 89520-3083

Gary Hestad, Ada.  
% W.C.D.A.  
P.O. Box 30083  
Reno Nevada 89520-3083

Storg Law Group  
% Robert Storg  
245 E. Liberty Street  
Suite 530  
Reno, NV 89501

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Brendan Dunchley #1023236

Defendant in Pro Per



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**AFFIRMATION**  
Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document, Motion  
for default bench decision for the motion(s) to  
withdraw guilty plea and supplemental in consideration  
(Title of Document)

filed in case number: CR07-1728

Document does not contain the social security number of any person

-OR-

Document contains the social security number of a person as required by:

A specific state or federal law, to wit:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(State specific state or federal law)

-OR-

For the administration of a public program

-OR-

For an application for a federal or state grant

-OR-

Confidential Family Court Information Sheet  
(NRS 125.130, NRS 125.230 and NRS 125B.055)

Date: 3/15/11

Brendan Dunchley  
(Signature)

Brendan Dunchley 1023236  
(Print Name)

defendant in Pro Per  
(Attorney for)

CRO7-1728  
DC-9900024678-008  
STATE VS BRENDAN DUNCKLEY ( 6 Pages  
District Court 03/28/2011 02 31 PM  
Washoe County 2175  
DOC  
JYOS

FILED

2011 MAR 28 PM 2:31

HOWARD W. CONYERS

BY [Signature]  
DEPUTY

1 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236  
2 N. N. C. C.  
3 P.O. Box 7000  
4 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

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

9 STATE OF NEVADA,  
10 PLAINTIFF, CASE NO.: CRO7-1728  
11 VS. DEPT. NO.: 4

12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,  
13 DEFENDANT, /

15 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SETTING

17 COMES NOW, DEFENDANT, BRENDAN DUNCKLEY, AND SUBMITS  
18 TO THIS COURT HIS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SETTING, IN  
19 CASE NUMBER CRO7-1728, MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY  
20 PLEA - ORAL ARGUMENTS, APRIL 22, 2011 HEARING.

21 DISTRICT COURT RULES OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT,  
22 RULE 13:(1), GIVE THIS DEFENDANT AUTHORITY TO VOICE HIS  
23 OBJECTION TO A CONTINUANCE IN THIS MATTER. THIS MOTION IS  
24 SUPPORTED BY THE FOLLOWING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES AS IS  
25 ALL MOVING PAPERS, PLEADINGS AND DOCUMENTS IN PURSUIT OF  
26 DEFENDANT WITHDRAWING HIS GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM MOTION  
27 FILED WITH THIS COURT ON MARCH 3, 2010.

1 " NO CONTINUANCE OF A TRIAL IN A CIVIL OR CRIMINAL  
2 CASE SHALL BE GRANTED EXCEPT FOR GOOD CAUSE. A  
3 MOTION OR STIPULATION FOR CONTINUANCE SHALL STATE THE  
4 REASON THEREFOR AND WHETHER OR NOT PREVIOUS REQUESTS  
5 FOR A CONTINUANCE HAS BEEN SOUGHT OR GRANTED. THE  
6 MOTION OR STIPULATION MUST CERTIFY THAT THE PARTY OR  
7 PARTIES HAVE BEEN ADVISED THAT A MOTION OR STIPULATION  
8 FOR CONTINUANCE IS TO BE SUBMITTED IN THEIR BEHALF  
9 AND MUST STATE ANY OBJECTION THE PARTIES MAY HAVE  
10 THERETO" SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT RULES: RULE 13

11  
12 AS I UNDERSTAND IT, IT WAS DUE TO A 'CONFLICT IN THE COURT  
13 CALENDER' THAT REQUIRED THE CONTINUANCE OF THE 'EVIDENTIARY  
14 HEARING ON PETION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST-CONVICTION)  
15 UNDER CASE NUMBER CRO7P1728. ROBERT STORY, ESQ HAS BEEN  
16 APPOINTED TO REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT IN THE POST-CONVICTION  
17 PROCEEDINGS ONLY, THEREFOR IN THE RECORDS OF THE CLERK, THE  
18 NUMEROUS PRIOR PLEADINGS THERE IS A CLEAR AND OBVIOUS  
19 SEPERATION BETWEEN CRO7-1728 AND CRO7P1728.

20 EVEN ON THE 'APPLICATION FOR SETTING' FILED BY THIS  
21 COURT ON MARCH 11, 2011 (1:13:07 PM) IT STATES:

22 'COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF: GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ.

23 'COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT: ROBERT STORY, ESQ.

24 'PRO PER DEFENDANT: BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

25 BY THIS LISTING THE DEFENDANT AS 'PRO PER' IT IS CLEAR THAT  
26 THE TWO CASES ARE SEPERATE AND INDEPENDANT 'ISSUES' BEFORE  
27 THE COURT. IN ADDITION AS IS COMMONLY KNOWN POST-CONVICTION

1 PROCEEDINGS ARE VIEWED, HEARD AND CONSTRUED AS A CIVIL  
2 ACTION, THEREFOR MANDATING THAT IN THE CASE OF A CONFLICT  
3 IN THE CALUNDER BETWEEN A POST-CONVICTION HEARING AND A  
4 CRIMINAL, THE LATTER TAKES PRECEDENCE,

5 BUT AGAIN SINCE MR. STURY HAS NO AUTHORITY OR  
6 'COUNSEL STATUS' IN CRO7-1728 AND THE MOTION FOR  
7 WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEA, THE COURT WAS CORRECT WHEN  
8 IT CLEARLY LISTED CRO7-1728 AS A "TYPE OF ACTION: CRIMINAL".

9 A CONFLICT FOR THE APRIL 1, 2011 EVIDENTIARY HEARING  
10 ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, WHICH IS A CIVIL  
11 ACTION HAS ABSOLUTLY NO CONNECTION NOR BEARING ON THE  
12 SEPERATE AND INDEPENDANT CRIMINAL MATTER SET FOR  
13 ORAL ARGUMENTS, BETWEEN GARY HARLESTAD, ESQ., AND THIS  
14 PRO PER DEFENDANT BRENDAN DUNCKLEY, SCHEDULED FOR APRIL  
15 22, 2011.

16 ON PAGE NUMBER 1, 27-28 OF THE APPLICATION FOR SETTING  
17 IT STATES:

18 "SETTING AT 9:00 P.M. ON THE 3<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2011

19 \*\* VACATES APRIL 22, 2011 HEARING \*\*"

20 IT IS THIS DEFENDANTS BELIEF AND CONTENTION THAT  
21 THERE ARE NUMEROUS ERRORS IN THIS APPLICATION, THAT THE  
22 LISTED COUNSEL SHOULD HAVE BROUGHT TO THIS COURTS ATTENTION.  
23 BOTH CLERICAL AS WELL AS ONES THAT MOLD SUBSTANTIAL  
24 LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS. FIRST THE CLERICAL ISSUES ARE AS  
25 FOLLOWS:

26 1) DEFENDANT / PETITIONER'S NAME LISTED ON LINE 11, 13  
27 IS INCORRECTLY SPELLED IT SHOULD READ DUNCKLEY;

1 2) SHOULD READ "SETTING AT 9:00 AM" NOT "SETTING AT  
2 9:00 PM.";

3 3) "VACATES APRIL 22, 2011 HEARING," SHOULD READ "VACATES  
4 APRIL 1, 2011 HEARING.";

5 THE LEGAL ERRORS ARE, AS STATED PRIOR, AT NO POINT  
6 SHOULD CRO7-1728 AND CRO7P1728 BE VIEWED AS A SINGLE  
7 ACTION. IF IT WERE DEEMED A SINGLE ACTION THEN IT IS  
8 ALSO TO BE DEEMED A 'CRIMINAL ACTION', AND AS THIS  
9 ACTION HAS BEEN FILED SINCE JULY 21, 2009 AND MARCH 3,  
10 2010, DUE PROCESS IN A CRIMINAL MATTER WILL PUT THE  
11 PRIORITY ON THIS MATTER ABOVE ANY OTHER CRIMINAL MATTER.  
12 SINCE IT HAS BEEN BEFORE THE COURT FOR JUST SHY OF THREE  
13 (3) YEARS AND JUST OVER ONE (1) YEAR.

14 ANOTHER LEGAL RAMIFICATION OF COMBINING THESE TWO  
15 MATTERS IS IT MAKES THIS DEFENDANT ALLOWABLE TO HOLD  
16 ALL PRIVILEGES OF CO-COUNSEL, AND VISA VERSA ALLOWS, STORY &  
17 GARY HATLESTAD TO PRESENT ORAL ARGUMENTS IN THE  
18 MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA.

19 BUT SINCE THESE MATTERS ARE SEPERATE AND INDEPENDANT  
20 SUCH 'COUNSEL STATUS ADJUSTMENT' DOES NOT APPLY. THE ADDING,  
21 OF KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. TO THE LIST OF SERVICE ONLY GOES  
22 TO SOLIDIFY THAT THESE CASES ARE SEPERATE ISSUES.

23 KELLI A. VILORIA IS AN ASSISTANT DEPUTY ATTORNEY IN THE  
24 CRIMINAL DIVISION AND IS LISTED IN CONNECTION TO THE  
25 HEARING SCHEDULED, IN CRO7-1728 AS IT IS A CRIMINAL  
26 ISSUE, NOT A POST-CONVICTION (I.E: CIVIL)

CONCLUSION

HART V. STATE, 1 P.3d 969 (NEV. 2000) CLEARLY INDICATES A DISTINCTION BETWEEN MOTIONS TO WITHDRAW A GUILTY PLEA AND A PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, SINCE A MOTION TO WITHDRAW A GUILTY PLEA IS 'INCIDENTAL TO PROCEEDINGS IN TRIAL COURT' (HART SUPRA 971) DCR 13 APPLYS TO NO GOOD FAITH REASON EXISTS TO CONTINUANCE OF APRIL 22, 2011 HEARING.

BENNETT V. STATE, 119 NEV, 589, 81 P.3d 1 (NEV. 2003) IT STATES THE REQUIREMENT OF DUE PROCESS BY THE PROSECUATION AND ALL OFFICERS OF THE COURT IS NOT ONLY CONSTITUTIONALLY DEMANDED BUT ARE BOUND BY THE ETHICS OF THEIR OFFICE AFTER THE CONVICTION.

AS DCR 13 (1) STATES THIS IS A FORMAL OBJECTION TO THE MERGER OF THE CRIMINAL CASE NUMBER: CR07-1728 AND THE CIVIL ACTION CASE NUMBER: CR07P1728; AND

FURTHER, THIS DEFENDANT, OBJECTS TO ANY CONTINUANCE FOR THE MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEA - ORAL ARGUMENTS, SET FOR APRIL 22, 2011; AND

FURTHER, THIS DEFENDANT, REQUESTS, THIS COURT TO ORDER CR07-1728 AND CR07P.1728 TO BE SEPERATE AND INDEPENDANT MATTERS; AND

FURTHER, THIS DEFENDANT, REQUESTS, THIS COURT BEINSTATE THE HEARING OF ORAL ARGUMENTS FOR APRIL 22, 2011 AT 9:00 AM; AND

FURTHER, THIS DEFENDANT, REQUESTS, THIS DEFENDANT'S STATUS AS PRO PER IN CR07-1728 REMAIN.

//

1 SUBMITTED THIS 21<sup>st</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2011

2  
3 Brendan Dunchley #1023236  
4 PRO PER DEFENDANT

5  
6 AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

7 THE UNDERSIGNED DOES HEREBY AFFIRM THAT THE PRECEDING  
8 DOCUMENT: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SETTING IN CR07-1728 DOES  
9 NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS OF ANY PERSON(S).  
10 DATED THIS 21<sup>st</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2011.

11  
12 Brendan Dunchley #1023236  
13 PRO PER DEFENDANT.

14 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

15 I CERTIFY THAT A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THIS PRECEDING MOTION  
16 FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SETTING, WAS MAILED TO THE ADDRESSES BELOW, BY  
17 PLACING SAME INTO THE HANDS OF PRISON LAW LIBRARY STAFF FOR MAILING

18 CLERK OF THE COURT  
19 SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
20 % DEPT 4, P.O. Box 30083  
21 RENO, NEVADA 89520-3083

W.C.D.A.  
% GARY HATLESTAD  
P.O. Box 30083  
RENO, NEVADA 89520-3083

22  
23 DATED THIS 21<sup>st</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2011

24  
25 Brendan Dunchley #1023236  
26 PRO PER DEFENDANT.


CR07-1728 DC-9900025794-059  
STATE VS BRENDAN DUNCKLEY ( 3 Pages  
District Court 05/09/2011 01 44 PM  
Washoe County 3860  
RSTTNCHE

1 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236  
2 N.N.C.C.  
3 P.O. Box 7000  
4 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89702

FILED

2011 MAY -9 PM 1:44

HOWARD J. CONYERS

BY 

5  
6 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF  
7 NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

8  
9 THE STATE OF NEVADA,

10 PLAINTIFF,

CASE NO: CR07-1728

11 VS.

DEPT. NO: 4


12 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

13 DEFENDANT, REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION

14  
15 COMES NOW, DEFENDANT, BRENDAN DUNCKLEY, APPEARING IN PROPER  
16 PERSON, AND FILES THIS REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION.

17 THIS REQUEST IS MADE PURSUANT TO DISTRICT COURT RULES, WHEREAS, THIS  
18 DEFENDANT RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS THAT HIS MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEA  
19 MEMORANDUM, AND ALL SUPPLEMENTAL MOVING PAPERS ASSOCIATED WITH THE  
20 ORIGINAL MOTION FILED MARCH 3, 2010, BE SUBMITTED TO THIS HONORABLE  
21 COURT FOR A DECISION, INCLUDING ALL MOTIONS FILED TO DATE.

22  
23 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 25<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2011

24  
25   
26 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY #1023236  
27 DEFENDANT IN PROPER



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**AFFIRMATION**  
**Pursuant to NRS 239B.030**

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document, \_\_\_\_\_

*REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION*

(Title of Document)

filed in case number: *CR07-1928*

Document does not contain the social security number of any person

**-OR-**

Document contains the social security number of a person as required by:

A specific state or federal law, to wit:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(State specific state or federal law)

**-or-**

For the administration of a public program

**-or-**

For an application for a federal or state grant

**-or-**

Confidential Family Court Information Sheet  
(NRS 125.130, NRS 125.230 and NRS 125B.055)

Date: *4/25/11*

*Brendan Dunchley*  
(Signature)

*BRENDAN DUNCKLEY*  
(Print Name)

*Defendant in Proper Person*  
(Attorney for)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

Pursuant to N.R.C.P. Rule 5 (b), I hereby certify that I am the Petitioner/Defendant named herein and that on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of APRIL 2011, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to the following:

CLERKS OF THE COURT / second Jud. Dist. \_\_\_\_\_

P.O. 30083 \_\_\_\_\_

Benx, New. 89520-3083 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Brendan Dunchley

Defendant Proper Person

1 **CODE 3370**

2

3

4

5

6

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

7

8

9

**THE STATE OF NEVADA,**

10

**Plaintiff,**

**Case No. CR07-1728**

11

**vs.**

**Dept. No. 4**

12

**BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,**

13

**Defendant.**

14

15

**ORDER**

16

On March 3, 2010, the Defendant filed a Motion for Withdrawal of Guilty Plea. On March 4, 2010, the Defendant filed a Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On April 23, 2010, this Court entered an Order staying Decision on the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea until outcome of the Defendant's appeal to the Nevada Supreme Court. On July 14, 2010, the Defendant filed an additional Supplement in Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On September 9, 2010, the Supreme Court entered an Order of Affirmance, with the remittitur being entered on October 15, 2010. On October 15, 2010, this Court entered an Order for the State to file a Response to the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and the Supplements to the Motion. On October 21, 2010, the State filed an Opposition to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea, Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and Supplement in Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On November 3, 2010, the Defendant filed a Response to State's Opposition to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea, Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and Supplement in

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On November 17, 2010, the Defendant  
2 formally submitted the Motion and its Supplements to the Court for decision. On January  
3 7, 2011, the Court ordered the Motion set for oral arguments. Oral Arguments were  
4 originally set for April 22, 2011, which was vacated due to the Court's trial calendar and  
5 reset for June 2, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. On May 9, 2011, the Defendant filed an additional  
6 Request for Submission of the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea Memo and all Supplemental  
7 Moving Papers.

8 The Court, having reviewed the pleadings filed herein, finds that the matter is  
9 currently set for oral arguments and therefore with good cause appearing,

10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea Memo and all  
11 Supplemental Moving Papers shall not be considered at this time and oral arguments  
12 remain on calendar for June 2, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

13 Dated this 24 day of May, 2011.

14  
15  
16 Cornie J. Steinheimer  
17 DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of the SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of the STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE; that on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2011, I electronically filed the attached document with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system, which sent a notice of electronic filing to the following:

Gary Hatlestad, Esq.  
Chief Deputy District Attorney

I further certify that on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2011, I deposited in the county mailing system for postage and mailing with the U.S. Postal Service, a true copy of the same, addressed to:

Brendan Dunckley  
Inmate no. 1023236  
NNCC  
P.O. Box 7000  
Carson City, Nevada 89702



**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\*  
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 05-31-2011:11:56:19  
**Clerk Accepted:** 05-31-2011:11:57:13  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Order...  
**Filed By:** Marci Trabert

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

1 **CODE 3370**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**  
7 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**  
8

9 **THE STATE OF NEVADA,**

10 **Plaintiff,**

**Case No. CR07-1728**

11 **vs.**

**Dept. No. 4**

12 **BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,**

13 **Defendant.**

14 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
15 **CORRECTED ORDER**

16 On March 3, 2010, the Defendant filed a Motion for Withdrawal of Guilty  
17 Plea. On March 4, 2010, the Defendant filed a Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty  
18 Plea. On April 23, 2010, this Court entered an Order staying Decision on the Motion to  
19 Withdraw Guilty Plea until outcome of the Defendant's appeal to the Nevada Supreme  
20 Court. On July 14, 2010, the Defendant filed an additional Supplement in Consideration of  
21 Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On September 9, 2010, the Supreme Court entered an  
22 Order of Affirmance, with the remittitur being entered on October 15, 2010. On October  
23 15, 2010, this Court entered an Order for the State to file a Response to the Motion to  
24 Withdraw Guilty Plea and the Supplements to the Motion. On October 21, 2010, the State  
25 filed an Opposition to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea, Supplement to Motion to Withdraw  
26 Guilty Plea and Supplement in Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On  
27 November 3, 2010, the Defendant filed a Response to State's Opposition to Motion to  
28 Withdraw Guilty Plea, Supplement to Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and Supplement in

1 Consideration of Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. On November 17, 2010, the Defendant  
2 formally submitted the Motion and its Supplements to the Court for decision. On January  
3 7, 2011, the Court ordered the Motion set for oral arguments. Oral Arguments were  
4 originally set for April 22, 2011, which was vacated due to the Court's trial calendar and  
5 reset for June 2, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. On May 9, 2011, the Defendant filed an additional  
6 Request for Submission of the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea Memo and all Supplemental  
7 Moving Papers.

8 The Court, having reviewed the pleadings filed herein, finds that the matter is  
9 currently set for oral arguments and therefore with good cause appearing,

10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea Memo and all  
11 Supplemental Moving Papers shall not be considered at this time and oral arguments  
12 remain on calendar for June 3, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

13 Dated this 31 day of May, 2011.

14  
15  
16   
17 Connie J. Steinheimer  
18 DISTRICT JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28




CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of the SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of the STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE; that on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2011, I electronically filed the attached document with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system, which sent a notice of electronic filing to the following:

Gary Hatlestad, Esq.  
Chief Deputy District Attorney

I further certify that on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2011, I deposited in the county mailing system for postage and mailing with the U.S. Postal Service, a true copy of the same, addressed to:

Brendan Dunckley  
Inmate no. 1023236  
NNCC  
P.O. Box 7000  
Carson City, Nevada 89702



**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 05-31-2011:12:08:57  
**Clerk Accepted:** 05-31-2011:12:09:25  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Order...  
**Filed By:** Marci Trabert

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

Code No. 4185

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE  
THE HONORABLE CONNIE STEINHEIMER, DISTRICT JUDGE

-oOo-

STATE OF NEVADA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. CR07-1728
	)	CR07P1728
vs.	)	
	)	Dept. No. 4
BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
MOTION TO WITHDRAW PLEA  
FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 2011  
RENO, NEVADA

Reported By:           STEPHANI L. LODER, CCR No. 862

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

GARY H. HATLESTAD  
Deputy District Attorney  
P.O. Box 30083  
Reno, Nevada 89520

For the Defendant:

ROBERT W. STORY  
Story Law Group  
245 East Liberty Street  
Suite 530  
Reno, Nevada 89501

INDEX

PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES: PAGE:

DAVID O'MARA,	
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HATLESTAD	67
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. STORY	92

DEFENSE WITNESSES: PAGE:

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,	
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STORY	24
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HATLESTAD	40
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STORY	64
RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HATLESTAD	65

\*\*\*\*\*

EXHIBITS

<u>NO.</u>	<u>MARKED:</u>	<u>ADMITTED:</u>
A.....	48	

\*\*\*\*\*

1 RENO, NEVADA, FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 2011, 9:35 A.M.

2 -oOo-

3  
4 THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.  
5 Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

6 MR. STORY: Yes, Your Honor.

7 MR. HATLESTAD: Ready, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Story.

9 MR. STORY: This is set for a motion to withdraw.  
10 Mr. Dunckley represents himself on that, so may he go  
11 forward?

12 THE COURT: Certainly.

13 MR. STORY: May he be unchained?

14 THE COURT: He can have his right hand,  
15 absolutely.

16 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.  
17 Good morning, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Good morning.

19 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, excuse my ignorance  
20 at times. I apologize. I'm not familiar with how to do  
21 this correctly.

22 But from what I can gather, the oral arguments  
23 for my motion to withdraw the guilty plea, it's my  
24 understanding that when a manifest injustice occurs after

1 a sentence has been carried out, that a guilty plea can be  
2 withdrawn if it can be proven that either ineffective  
3 assistance of counsel was not ratified, involuntary pleas,  
4 or if the State violated the contract in some way, shape,  
5 or form.

6 It's further my belief that the guilty plea is  
7 construed and viewed as a contract between myself and the  
8 State with due process.

9 I raised numerous issues, but the one before us  
10 here today that Mr. Hatlestad is arguing is the  
11 availability of probation. I am contesting the fact that,  
12 in 1997, the legislative statute deleted probationability  
13 for the statute of lewdness.

14 Now, for the record, at no time in any of the  
15 motions or moving papers have I argued that probation is  
16 not available for the second charge, attempted sexual  
17 assault. The only argument in contestation (sic) is the  
18 lewdness charge. As a guilty plea memorandum is construed  
19 as a whole, the entirety should be viewed as such.

20 The law basically -- it boils down to a dispute  
21 and a disagreement or discrepancy or, as the Court's view,  
22 a conflict between two statutes. I believe, in my opinion  
23 in the moving papers, that the statute is clear, plain,  
24 and unambiguous.

1           In 1997, the law read -- or 1998 when the -- for  
2 the record, it read that: "A violation 201.230 is defined  
3 as a person who willfully and lewdly commits any lewd or  
4 lascivious act other than acts constituting the crime of  
5 sexual assault upon the body or part or member thereof of  
6 a child under the age of 14 years with the intent of  
7 arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions  
8 or sexual desires of that person or of that child is a  
9 Category A felony and shall be punished by imprisonment in  
10 the State Prison for life with the possibility of parole,  
11 with eligibility for parole beginning when a minimum of  
12 ten years has been served and may be further punished by a  
13 fine of not more than \$10,000."

14           The law was clear and unambiguous. The meaning  
15 and the intent of the Legislature was clear.

16           Mr. Hatlestad and the State's contention was and  
17 argument was that a secondary rule or a general statute,  
18 ergo NRS 176A.110, actually allowed for probation up until  
19 the year 2003.

20           Unfortunately, if Mr. Hatlestad had quoted fully,  
21 the law read in that statute: "The Court shall not grant  
22 probation or suspend the sentence of a person convicted of  
23 an offense listed in subsection (3) unless," and  
24 subsection (3) reads: "The provisions of this section



1 apply to a person convicted of any of the following  
2 offenses."

3 Specifically, Mr. Hatlestad referred to section  
4 (j) which read -- which previously read "lewdness with a  
5 child pursuant to 201.230." But if you read further, it  
6 says "an attempt to commit an offense listed in paragraphs  
7 (b) through (m), inclusively."

8 Your Honor, it's my understanding that two things  
9 happened here. One, by using the terminology "pursuant  
10 to," and "according to" carrying out in the conformity  
11 with the statute.

12 The statute that that wording gives the  
13 precedence to is 201.230. And as we know, a conflict  
14 between two statutes, between a general and specific, the  
15 specific, which is the criminal statute, will take  
16 precedence. Because of that, 176A does not hold any  
17 bearing because it automatically shifts the authority to  
18 201.230.

19 But more importantly, it's further on in section  
20 (n) where it says the attempt to commit any of the these  
21 offenses, inclusively.

22 I was never charged, Your Honor, with attempt to  
23 commit lewdness. I was charged with lewdness. So again,  
24 it holds no bearing in this case. At no time was

1 probation available.

2 If -- as you know, Your Honor, if a statute is  
3 unclear on its face, then we review the legislative  
4 intent. What was the history?

5 Washoe County District Attorney's office had a  
6 part in the changing of this Legislature. In 1997, on  
7 May 22nd, 1997, before the judiciary committee, Mr. Egan  
8 Walker represented the district attorney's office for  
9 Washoe. And in it, he said, in favor of the new bill, of  
10 AB 280, he said that there is a scythe at the bottom of  
11 the system, that there's a problem with the current  
12 Legislature.

13 By that, he was referring to people are being  
14 charged with sexual assault and being allowed to plead to  
15 a lesser offense of lewdness which was a probationable  
16 offense. They thought and adamantly their opinion was  
17 that not only should that stop and that, quote, scythe  
18 close, but that it should be equally as severe of a  
19 punishment.

20 The law previously read before October 1st of  
21 1997 when it went into effect that it was a Category B  
22 felony, not a Category A, and was punishable with a  
23 sentence of two to ten years, not a ten to life. When AB  
24 280 went into effect, it had the full support of the

1 Washoe County District Attorney's office. It deleted  
2 probation from the statute. It increased the punishment  
3 to a ten to life, and it also increased the punishment to  
4 a Category A felony.

5 And as you're aware, Your Honor, and every  
6 officer of the court knows, after 1995, a Category A  
7 felony can only be punished by one of three ways: life  
8 with or without the possibility of parole and death. At  
9 no point can I be offered probation.

10 It is my belief that not once, not twice, but 112  
11 different times probation was mentioned as a viable  
12 option. Even Mr. Hatlestad in his argument conceded to  
13 the fact that if probation were not available, the motion  
14 should be granted. It shows that it's inseparable for the  
15 fact that it was a deciding factor amongst whether or not  
16 to enter this contract or to proceed to trial.

17 But also the fact that even if we looked further,  
18 not only the legislative history, not only is the law  
19 clear, the legislative history is clear. The district  
20 attorney's office even argued that probation should never  
21 be allowed. But more importantly, the Nevada Supreme  
22 Court even ruled in 1997, in a case of *Scott v. State*. He  
23 was a minor at that time charged with lewdness, and the  
24 Court said that that was an incorrect statute to charge a

1 minor with. It should have been a delinquency charge.  
2 But Chief Shearing, in her concurring opinion, stated that  
3 it's not difficult, in discussing the original charge,  
4 it's not difficult to see the difference between a  
5 non-probational felony with a life prison sentence and the  
6 delinquency, an adjudicated delinquency with three years  
7 probation.

8 The Supreme Court's already given an opinion as  
9 to what the punishment was by saying it's  
10 nonprobationable, but the key also was a life prison  
11 sentence; ergo it was a Category A felony.

12 The State's only argument in the entire motion --  
13 I've given 137 cases to support it, to support my argument  
14 and my contention. I've supported it with the record. At  
15 no point does my personal opinion have any bearing in this  
16 matter except as to what I personally understood to be the  
17 terms of the deal when I entered into the contract.

18 I believed that probation was available. That's  
19 the only reason I agreed to enter this plea. At that  
20 time, it was the advice of my counsel that probation would  
21 be available.

22 You, yourself -- I know you're busy, Your Honor,  
23 but if I could refresh your memory, when I came before you  
24 to enter my plea, the district attorney and my attorney

1 made comments to the point of saying that at -- I  
2 apologize, Your Honor. I'm just -- I'm trying to fight  
3 for my freedom here, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: That's okay.

5 THE DEFENDANT: Mr. O'Mara stated that the  
6 agreement with -- the fact that the agreement was between  
7 the district attorney and my attorney was to set out  
8 sentencing for five to six months. I don't know if you  
9 remember that or not. But -- I'm sorry, here it is.

10 And he said -- Mr. O'Mara said, and I quote,  
11 "Your Honor, there's been negotiation with the district  
12 attorney's office to set this out for five to six months  
13 so that Mr. Dunckley can get the sexual offender therapy  
14 during that period of time. And basically the DA is  
15 giving him every opportunity to try to qualify for  
16 probation and to do the things that will be beneficial for  
17 him to present to you at sentencing. She's allowed for a  
18 five- to six-month extension so that he can get those type  
19 of therapy classes. And so we'd ask that type of time  
20 before sentencing."

21 Ms. Viloría, who is no longer with the district  
22 attorney's office, stated at the time, "Your Honor, my  
23 agreement is just to see if this defendant is worthy of  
24 any type of grant of probation, whether he can earn it or

1 not. I want to see what he does between now and then, so  
2 I do not object to any type of continuance that Mr. O'Mara  
3 is seeking, is asking for to set out the sentencing date."

4 Even Mr. Hatlestad in his argument clearly showed  
5 that if probation were not available, to quote him, he  
6 said, "It necessarily follows that if probation were not  
7 available, the motion should be granted. It's  
8 interchange -- it's unacceptable."

9 The only case that Mr. Hatlestad used in rebuttal  
10 and opposition was -- he cited *Skinner*, *Aswegan*, and  
11 *Meyers*, which were ultimately overruled by *Little*. And  
12 it's an interesting fact that I was celled up with  
13 Mr. Little at the time when I got this opposition from  
14 Mr. Hatlestad, and I read Mr. Little's case. And the fact  
15 that he failed to realize the fact that in Mr. Little's  
16 case, it was the fact that probation not available and he  
17 knew probation was not available. So therefore it was not  
18 necessary for the judge to convey that information.

19 That's the exact opposite of what's gone on here.  
20 I was led to believe probation was available when the law  
21 clearly states that it was not. It was an illusory deal  
22 to start with for the fact that, yes, I benefitted  
23 because, in exchange, the State lessened the charges and  
24 lowered or changed the charges.

1           But also, by the record, I have never attacked  
2 the charges specifically on what was amended. I have  
3 always and fully attacked the charges on what the original  
4 charges were.

5           For an actual innocence plea or a manifest  
6 injustice, I've always attacked the charge that the State  
7 has forgiven and gone to the lesser offense. I've shown  
8 both areas. And the State's only contention is that 176A  
9 allowed for probation; so, therefore, I am incorrect.

10          My opinion, like I said, has no bearing. What  
11 does the law say? What does the history say? Is it  
12 clear? Is it ambiguous? But it's not ambiguous. It's  
13 unambiguous. The meaning is clear.

14          When they introduced the statute and the changed  
15 law in 1997, see -- the assemblywoman that did it,  
16 Ms. Berman, did it because she said that it was necessary  
17 to increase the sentences to these people who are  
18 committing crimes under the age of 14.

19          The district attorney's office agreed with this.  
20 They said that it was necessary rather than allowing  
21 people to skate by, so to speak, and hide from the  
22 mandatory prison sentence that the sexual assault carried,  
23 but instead they would go to the lesser offense of  
24 lewdness. And they fought adamantly for it to be deleted,

1 and they won.

2 In 1997, the law changed, and it deleted  
3 probation. And as the attorney general even stated that  
4 year, that these punishments should be severely punished.  
5 The law is clear. The statutes are clear. There's no  
6 room for interchanging or trying to find our personal  
7 interpretation.

8 So with that, I -- unfortunately, because of the  
9 fact that 176A, which is the only contention and the only  
10 counterargument that Mr. Hatlestad used, holds no merit  
11 because of two grounds. One, it in itself gives the  
12 authority to NRS 201.230 by the terminology "pursuant to";  
13 and, two, it was never an attempt to commit the crime.

14 The law was clear. The State knew what it was  
15 doing when it changed the law. Its intent was to make it  
16 more severe by changing the statute and changing the  
17 category in the felony in itself. It changed everything  
18 about it.

19 No longer could we file a fast-track appeal, as  
20 Mr. O'Mara found out. You could file a fast-track appeal  
21 when a sentence carries a Category A felony. If life is  
22 attached to a sentence, it must be a full appeal. Even  
23 the way we attack it in the appellate area is changed when  
24 they change that statute, Your Honor.



1           That's it for now.

2           THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

3           Mr. Hatlestad?

4           MR. HATLESTAD: Thanks, Your Honor. Mr. Dunckley  
5 was eligible for probation under the laws that existed at  
6 the time the offense was committed. You said so. The  
7 Supreme Court said so. And the statutes of Nevada say so.

8           I think where Mr. Dunckley is confused is he's  
9 talking about the specific versus general. Not really  
10 sure what that implies here. Usually, when you think  
11 about that, it talks about definition of offenses.

12           So for example, if you had a case that said --  
13 the prosecution has said unlawful possession of an eagle  
14 feather, which obviously is a category X felony, but the  
15 specific statute would say possession of a golden eagle  
16 feather, and that would have its own definition. That  
17 really doesn't apply to the sentencing range.

18           The Legislature has said that probation is  
19 available under certain circumstances for lewdness. I  
20 don't see -- I don't really see the confusion. I don't  
21 see a conflict.

22           The notion of "pursuant" would be the definition  
23 of the offense. I just don't see the confusion that  
24 Mr. Dunckley is suggesting exists to the point of a

1 conflict or ambiguity where we have to appeal the  
2 legislative history.

3 If Mr. Walker's position was that defendant could  
4 be hammered in this case, and it's apparent that he was  
5 unsuccessful in convincing them because now we have the  
6 statute which is a replacement of the statute that existed  
7 at the time, which is -- I can't remember exactly the  
8 statute, the Nevada page. Looks like it would have been  
9 2503. There's a paragraph in that section in the old  
10 statute bracketed out. And then we have the italicized  
11 portion which I have here if you want to see it, which is  
12 the new statute, that is the statute that Mr. Dunckley  
13 sentence is coming under.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. HATLESTAD: So I think the argument is  
16 somewhat interesting, but I think misdirected. I disagree  
17 fundamentally with the major premise of the argument that  
18 there's a specific general dichotomy here and that the law  
19 is clear. I obviously agree with that in principle. But  
20 what he thinks is clear is not what I think is clear.

21 I think it's obvious from reading the statute  
22 that was enacted in 1997 that probation was available.  
23 You said it and the Nevada Supreme Court said it in this  
24 case. So I think the argument, albeit interesting, is

1 misguided.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, Mr. Hatlestad is a  
4 busy man. So are you. You're a busy judge. And you both  
5 have seen thousands of cases since I was last in your  
6 courtroom.

7 I spent the last three years doing nothing but  
8 researching this law, not from an angry defendant, but  
9 from every other aspect but mine.

10 Mr. Hatlestad refers to the fact of the law on  
11 page 20 -- 2053 -- 2503. I have that here. And in  
12 actuality, what it says is, to be specific, it deleted the  
13 paragraph -- the subsection heading of number one for the  
14 designation, which means that there's nothing further  
15 after that paragraph.

16 They -- what Mr. Hatlestad is referring to is  
17 that the fact it's a bracket of two through six which,  
18 yes, it previously did read:

19 "A person convicted of violating any of the  
20 provisions in subsection (1) must not be  
21 released on probation unless a psychological  
22 list -- psychologist licensed to practice in  
23 the state of Nevada or a psychiatrist  
24 licensed to practice medicine in the state

1 of Nevada certifies that the person so  
2 convicted is not a menace to health, safety,  
3 or morals of others."

4 That was deleted, Your Honor. That was deleted.  
5 And further, the law, how it finally read was  
6 actually found for the 1999 laws. And I have --

7 MR. HATLESTAD: Wait a minute. Wait a minute.  
8 Hang on.

9 THE COURT: Objection?

10 MR. HATLESTAD: Yes. Objection, Your Honor. I'm  
11 going to object. He's not reading the next page. The  
12 next page is subsection (7) which relocates the old  
13 statute.

14 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I have -- I have the  
15 copy of the Legislature right here. I'm not  
16 cherry-picking the law to fit mine. I never -- I -- if  
17 you'd like to --

18 THE COURT: I'm sorry. What are you looking at?

19 THE DEFENDANT: I'm looking at the legislative  
20 history from the 69th sessions, page 2503. Same thing  
21 Mr. Hatlestad is referring to.

22 MR. HATLESTAD: Statutes of Nevada.

23 THE DEFENDANT: It's the Nevada statutes, Chapter  
24 524, page 2503.

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2 THE DEFENDANT: And it's clearly here that the  
3 final part of that, the next sentence that Mr. Hatlestad  
4 is referring to is section (5) of NRS 201.450. There's  
5 never been a section (7) in the entire history of this  
6 law.

7 MR. HATLESTAD: It's on the next page. Object.

8 THE COURT: Do you have the next page?

9 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I have -- the only  
10 thing on here that says sections for the purpose --  
11 section of breastfeeding a child by the mother of a child  
12 is not --

13 THE COURT: We can't go by the --

14 THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm saying -- I'm saying for  
15 the fact that, Your Honor, I have the page, and if you  
16 would like --

17 THE COURT: You have the page you're reading.

18 THE DEFENDANT: I have the page I'm reading. And  
19 the law --

20 THE COURT: And what page number is that?

21 THE DEFENDANT: 2503.

22 THE COURT: Do you have 2504?

23 THE DEFENDANT: I do not have 2504, because the  
24 law stops at that point. That's why he goes to the next

1 law -- he goes to the next statute.

2 THE COURT: Just a minute.

3 Do you have 2504?

4 MR. HATLESTAD: I do.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Let's show Mr. Dunckley 2504.

6 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, what Mr. Hatlestad is  
7 referring to, 2504, actually is dealing with NRS 176A.110.  
8 It has nothing on the redistribution of the statute that I  
9 was convicted of.

10 Again, he's misquoting -- he's directing  
11 something differently. What he's referring to on section  
12 (7) refers to the -- the not granted probation that's  
13 basically the law of 176A. So --

14 THE COURT: What does it say?

15 THE DEFENDANT: 176A: The Court shall not grant  
16 probation unless -- as it was set forth:

17 "The Court shall not grant probation or  
18 suspend the sentence of a person convicted  
19 of an offense listed in subsection (3)  
20 unless a psychologist licensed to practice  
21 in this state or a psychiatrist licensed to  
22 practice in Nevada certifies that the person  
23 is not a menace to the safety and health of  
24 others."

1           And then it goes further, and he's highlighted  
2           lewdness with a child pursuant to 201.230. But then  
3           again, he again fails to bring this fact up, Your Honor.  
4           Paragraph (m) says: "An attempt to commit an offense  
5           listed in paragraphs (b) through (l) inclusive."

6           I was never charged with the attempt to commit  
7           lewdness.

8           THE COURT: Okay. So your argument is that you  
9           think it only applies -- that section only applies to an  
10          attempt?

11          THE DEFENDANT: As being the fact that it  
12          lists --

13          THE COURT: Don't tell me the law. Is that your  
14          argument?

15          THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. On that area, yes.

16          THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

17          THE DEFENDANT: But the law that I was punished,  
18          I was sentenced to, the law that I was charged with was  
19          clear at the end of the statute. It didn't say subsection  
20          (7), see this law. It never referred to 176A. It never  
21          referred to probation. It never referred to anything but  
22          a ten to life sentence with a Category A felony.

23          The law was clear. It's plain and simple. The  
24          fact that the State's only contention -- we have to -- I

1 don't want the Court to forget the fact that the only  
2 thing I'm bringing here is the fact that I waited for  
3 Mr. Hatlestad to bring up the argument of all the other  
4 areas that I brought up.

5 A manifest injustice is not just simply this one  
6 area. The motions that I wrote were not based solely on  
7 probation, were based on the fact of a contract analysis  
8 on the fraud on the court, on the withholding of material  
9 facts.

10 The motions that I brought forward were numerous  
11 issues that Mr. Hatlestad just grazed over. And at no  
12 point did he address those issues. He let them stand  
13 unchallenged. 27 different areas of contract law and  
14 fraud by the State and by former counsel withholding  
15 material facts.

16 Mr. O'Mara, if we go further, will turn around  
17 and will probably testify saying: I advised my client not  
18 to take this deal. I told him it's not in his best  
19 interest.

20 But what he failed to say is the fact that I  
21 never even saw the material information. For example --

22 THE COURT: I think you are arguing your  
23 post-conviction.

24 THE DEFENDANT: I actually, Your Honor --



1 THE COURT: You're arguing your ineffective  
2 assistance of counsel claims, and as they relate to your  
3 motion to withdraw, you have an attorney to argue that.  
4 So I don't want to hear it twice.

5 THE DEFENDANT: I understand, Your Honor. I  
6 apologize. Thank you.

7 So basically what I'm saying is the fact, Your  
8 Honor, is that the State only chose, out of the numerous  
9 areas, to focus on the one thing of probation. We can't  
10 overlook the fact that I've shown and proven numerous,  
11 numerous other manifest injustices have occurred.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to take  
13 that under submission.

14 You may proceed.

15 MR. STORY: Thank you, Your Honor. May I call  
16 Brendan Dunckley?

17 THE COURT: You may.

18  
19 **BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,**  
20 called as a witness by the defense,  
21 having been first duly sworn, was examined  
22 and testified as follows:  
23

24 THE COURT: Mr. Story, before we begin, would you

1 make a record with regard to your client waiving any  
2 issues.

3 MR. STORY: Yes, Your Honor.

4

5 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

6 BY MR. STORY:

7 Q Mr. Dunckley, you understand that by testifying  
8 today, you waive the attorney/client privilege; is that  
9 correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Are you willing to waive the attorney  
12 client/privilege in this case?

13 A Yes, I want to.

14 MR. STORY: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Thank you.

16 BY MR. STORY:

17 Q Please state and spell your name for the record.

18 A Brendan Dunckley, D-U-N-C-K-L-E-Y.

19 Q And where are you presently housed?

20 A I'm currently incarcerated at Northern Nevada  
21 Correctional Center.

22 Q Are you convicted of any crimes?

23 A Yes, I am.

24 Q What are those crimes?

1           A     I am convicted of lewdness with a child under the  
2 age of 14 and attempted sexual assault.

3           Q     Were you charged with other crimes prior to being  
4 convicted of these crimes?

5           A     In lieu of the deal?

6           Q     Yes, in this case.

7           A     Yes, I was.

8           Q     And what were those crimes?

9           A     I believe it was sexual assault with a child and  
10 sexual assault.

11          Q     Did you know what the potential sentences for  
12 those particular crimes was at the time?

13          A     At the time?

14          Q     At the time that you entered into your plea  
15 ultimately.

16          A     I don't recall.

17          Q     Were you arrested on these charges?

18          A     Yes, I was.

19          Q     Were you assigned an attorney?

20          A     Yes, I was.

21          Q     Who was that attorney?

22          A     David O'Mara.

23          Q     Did you meet with your attorney?

24          A     Prior to preliminary hearing, no.

1 Q When did you first meet with your attorney?

2 A The morning of the preliminary hearing, July 2nd.

3 Q How long did you meet with Mr. O'Mara?

4 A 15 minutes.

5 Q Did you discuss the case?

6 A He presented the NRSs to me and I gave him  
7 documentation. That was the extent of it. I gave him  
8 documentation of my location whereabouts.

9 Q Okay. Let me try to flesh that out a little bit.  
10 What do you mean you gave him documentation?

11 A I gave him documentation for the allegations of  
12 the sexual assault on a child and the -- with the Ashley  
13 charge, and I gave him documentation of my location being  
14 in New York State and college at the time in Hyde Park,  
15 New York.

16 I gave him court paperwork proving that or  
17 establishing the fact that I was in California up until  
18 August 16th when I was served with divorce papers in  
19 California. And I -- which is a summons of service I gave  
20 him.

21 I gave him copies of the original registration  
22 for the Ford Taurus that Ashley and I allegedly had sex in  
23 that was purchased and registered on June 5th of 2000.

24 Q Why was that relevant?

1           A     Well, the allegations from Ashley was that while  
2 she was 12 years old, between August of 1998 and August of  
3 1999, after spending the night at my house numerous,  
4 numerous times, she and I drove -- I drove her home one  
5 morning, and we stopped on the side of the road and had  
6 consensual sex in the backseat of the Ford Taurus. She  
7 contended at the preliminary that she was 12 years old.

8           A     And per Mr. Clifton, the window of offense was  
9 close to October 14th of 1998 to October 13th of 1999.

10          Q     So what you're saying is that registration would  
11 show that you hadn't committed that crime.

12          A     Well, not only the registration, but all the  
13 other documentation as well, yes.

14          Q     I may be under the mistaken impression -- I  
15 thought you might have been in custody at the time you met  
16 with Mr. O'Mara; is that correct?

17          A     No. I was out on bail the whole time.

18          Q     Okay. So you're out on bail, and you met with  
19 Mr. O'Mara 15 minutes prior to preliminary hearing; is  
20 that correct?

21          A     Yes.

22          Q     And you provided him documentation?

23          A     Yes, I did.

24          Q     And that documentation, from your perspective,

1 | exonerated you from these crimes?

2 |       A     For the allegations of Ashley, yes, it did.

3 |       Q     All right. Did you discuss this with Mr. O'Mara?

4 |       A     I did.

5 |       Q     And what did you tell him?

6 |       A     I told him that I had documentation to dispute  
7 | the allegations, and he informed me that this was not the  
8 | proper time and that if he saw a need, he would bring it  
9 | forward.

10 |       Q     Did you ever ask Mr. O'Mara to conduct an  
11 | investigation?

12 |       A     I did.

13 |       Q     And what did you tell Mr. O'Mara?

14 |       A     That I had -- that the allegation with Jessica  
15 | never occurred and that if he actually looked into the  
16 | paperwork that I provided, he could show that the  
17 | allegations -- the remaining allegations could not have  
18 | happened either.

19 |       Q     Do you know whether or not Mr. O'Mara ever  
20 | conducted an investigation?

21 |       A     Not to my knowledge, he did not.

22 |       Q     Did you ever speak with an investigator who  
23 | represented Mr. O'Mara?

24 |       A     Never.

1 Q Did you provide Mr. O'Mara with any other  
2 documentation?

3 A I provided him with IRS paperwork going back to  
4 1994 proving my location and my residency. I believe I  
5 further provided him with -- later I provided him with  
6 altered police reports from Detective Tom Broome that he  
7 released to my ex-wife's attorney in California, and I  
8 presented the stamped copies of the altered police  
9 reports. And I was informed that that had no bearing and  
10 it didn't matter.

11 Q What did the altered police reports prove or  
12 disprove from your perspective?

13 A Well, it was -- if you look at the originals and  
14 you look at the altered, it's cut and pasted to basically  
15 fit a end result, basically, to prove that I was just -- I  
16 was guilty, and the only --

17 MR. HATLESTAD: I'm going to object, Your Honor.  
18 This is best evidence.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

20 Do you have the documents?

21 MR. STORY: I do not, Your Honor.

22 THE DEFENDANT: Actually, Your Honor, it's in the  
23 record. I have the documents in the writ of habeas  
24 corpus.

1 MR. HATLESTAD: They haven't been offered. They  
2 haven't been authenticated.

3 THE DEFENDANT: They have the detective's  
4 signature and release --

5 THE COURT: You can't argue --

6 THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry.

7 MR. STORY: I'll move on, Your Honor. Thank you.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 BY MR. STORY:

10 Q How many times do you believe you met with  
11 Mr. O'Mara before you ultimately pleaded guilty?

12 A Maybe three or four times.

13 Q How much time did you spend with Mr. O'Mara?

14 A There was one time where I came just to pick up a  
15 piece of -- the discovery, and the other times I think I  
16 was there for maybe ten minutes.

17 Q And did you ever discover any other evidence that  
18 you thought would disprove the fact that you committed  
19 these crimes?

20 A I did after I had been convicted.

21 Q What evidence did you find?

22 A I found in the file that Mr. O'Mara forwarded to  
23 me while I was incarcerated in Lovelock Correctional  
24 Center, I found a -- the original offer from Ms. Viloría



1 to Mr. O'Mara. And then I found a fax that was dated  
2 three days after the offer of the current deal I'm under,  
3 which was a DNA test result from the Washoe County  
4 Forensic Lab exonerated of the charge of sexual assault  
5 against Jessica.

6 MR. HATLESTAD: Your Honor, I'm going to object  
7 to that characterization.

8 THE COURT: Sustained.

9 BY MR. STORY:

10 Q Why do you believe that that DNA --

11 THE COURT: Do you have that?

12 MR. STORY: Do we have that document?

13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, we do.

14 MR. STORY: Yes. May I -- he brought the entire  
15 file. I did not, Your Honor. May I have Mr. Dunckley  
16 come and pull that out?

17 THE COURT: Well, do pull it, but not this  
18 second.

19 MR. HATLESTAD: I don't object to the report  
20 coming in. I object to the characterization.

21 THE COURT: That's what I assume, but I'd like to  
22 have the report come in. I don't want to lose track and  
23 lose the report.

24 MR. STORY: I will bring in the report in, and I

1 will have Mr. Dunckley testify as to --

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. STORY: -- why he thinks it disproves or  
4 proves some -- proves in this case --

5 THE COURT: He's not an expert.

6 MR. STORY: I understand that, Your Honor, but he  
7 is in a position to testify. He was alleged to have  
8 committed this crime.

9 THE COURT: You want him to comment on the  
10 report?

11 MR. STORY: Yes. No, not on the report exactly.  
12 The report speaks for itself.

13 THE COURT: Then that's what it does. That's the  
14 point.

15 MR. STORY: My position, Your Honor, is that the  
16 report suggests something to Mr. -- if Mr. Dunckley had  
17 had this report prior to entering into the plea bargain,  
18 he would not have entered into the plea bargain. That's  
19 the point of the question.

20 THE COURT: Well, you can ask him that.

21 MR. STORY: Thank you.

22 BY MR. STORY:

23 Q Had you seen this DNA report prior to entering  
24 into the plea bargain, would it have changed your mind in

1 any way?

2 A Absolutely.

3 Q And why is that?

4 A Because by the allegation that was made -- it was  
5 a specific allegation that Jessica made -- the DNA test  
6 result showed absolutely no foreign DNA except for my own.  
7 No foreign DNA was obtained from the general swabs. It  
8 would have completely exonerated me. The specific  
9 allegation --

10 MR. HATLESTAD: I'll object to that.

11 THE COURT: Sustained.

12 THE DEFENDANT: I apologize.

13 BY MR. STORY:

14 Q And had you had this DNA report prior to pleading  
15 guilty, you would not have pleaded guilty; is that what  
16 you're saying?

17 A No.

18 Q Did Mr. O'Mara have this report before he advised  
19 you to plead guilty or talked to you about pleading  
20 guilty?

21 A Yes, he did.

22 Q How do you know that?

23 A Because the fax indicated February 7th, 2008, and  
24 it was a direct fax from Ms. Vilorio's office to

1 Mr. O'Mara.

2 Q And when did you plead guilty?

3 A March 6th, 2008.

4 Q Was there any other evidence that you discovered  
5 in the file that Mr. O'Mara provided you that would have  
6 altered your opinion about pleading guilty?

7 A Besides the fact that I saw no investigation or  
8 interview of any sort.

9 MR. HATLESTAD: That's not responsive, Your  
10 Honor. I object.

11 THE COURT: Sustained. Asking for that testimony  
12 to be stricken?

13 MR. HATLESTAD: Yeah, that's fine.

14 THE COURT: It is stricken.

15 MR. STORY: Let me reask the question. Maybe you  
16 misunderstood it.

17 BY MR. STORY:

18 Q Was there any other evidence that you found in  
19 the file that would have altered your opinion about  
20 pleading guilty?

21 A The -- I can't say off the top of my head. I'm  
22 not a lawyer. I know the case. I just -- I don't want to  
23 speak out of turn.

24 But, I mean, to me, the withholding of that

1 evidence or that documentation without my knowledge was --  
2 I can't -- to me -- I apologize to the Court. I can't get  
3 past, to me, that issue.

4 Q Once you reviewed the file that Mr. O'Mara  
5 provided you when you were in prison, did it alter your  
6 view of what you should have done in this case?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And how was that?

9 A Well, after looking at the file and looking at  
10 the record and looking at the law, in my opinion, no way I  
11 would have ever taken this deal or entered in this  
12 contract. I would have wanted to go to trial.

13 Q And you found no evidence of an investigation  
14 having been conducted; is that correct?

15 A None at all.

16 Q Did you ask Mr. O'Mara to conduct an  
17 investigation?

18 A Yes, I did.

19 Q You at some point pleaded guilty; is that  
20 correct?

21 A Yes, I did.

22 Q Did you discuss the guilty plea with your  
23 attorney?

24 A I discussed it literally moments before court at

1 his office when he gave me the deal that morning. And he  
2 said that it didn't matter what evidence he presented or  
3 what documents were presented. I'd be found guilty, and  
4 my best option and my best availability and my best tactic  
5 would be to take the deal and fight for probation.

6 Q Did you have an understanding as to what it took  
7 on your part to be eligible for probation?

8 A From what I understood, if I certified as a low  
9 risk to reoffend after a psychosexual evaluation.

10 Q And what did you have to be certified as a low  
11 risk?

12 A Well, along with meeting with therapists to be  
13 evaluated, I also participated in I believe almost 17  
14 sessions with Dr. Ing in both group sessions and  
15 individual counseling.

16 Q Did this cost you money?

17 A It did.

18 Q Did it take time away from you?

19 A Yes, it did.

20 Q And did you do what you were required to prove  
21 yourself to be a low-risk offender?

22 A I kept up my side of the complete contract, yes.

23 Q So you did everything you were required to do?

24 A Yes, I did.

1 Q And your reason for entering into the plea  
2 bargain was what?

3 A At the time, the community environment was going  
4 on, it was days before they had just found Brianna  
5 Denison's body at the time. And it was my counsel's  
6 advice that because of the environment with the community,  
7 that I would be -- it was my best interest to take this  
8 deal as opposed to going to trial.

9 Q And your counsel at the time was Mr. O'Mara; is  
10 that correct?

11 A Yes, it was.

12 Q Was there any other reason that Mr. O'Mara  
13 provided you for taking this deal?

14 A None.

15 Q Did he advise you on what you needed to do to  
16 obtain probation?

17 A I was to attend my classes, my therapy groups,  
18 and to keep my side of the agreement, refrain from  
19 alcohol, drugs, meet with Court Services, meet with P&P,  
20 become evaluated, and be honest with the evaluation.

21 Q And did you do you all of those things?

22 A I did.

23 Q And you ultimately pleaded guilty; is that  
24 correct?

1 A Yes, I did.

2 Q And what did you plead guilty to?

3 A I pled guilty to lewdness with minor under the  
4 age of 14 and attempted sexual assault.

5 Q Did you appear at sentencing?

6 A I did.

7 Q And did your attorney argue for probation?

8 A He did.

9 Q And did you get probation?

10 A No, I did not.

11 Q Do you know why you didn't get probation?

12 THE COURT: Because I didn't give it to him.

13 THE DEFENDANT: Per -- to be specific, per the  
14 decision of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Connie  
15 Steinheimer used her discretion, judicial discretion, to  
16 impose the sentence of imprisonment.

17 BY MR. STORY:

18 Q What was the time frame in the charge, do you  
19 recall, of the lewdness with a minor?

20 A The time that the offense occurred as opposed to  
21 when they originally charged me?

22 Q The time that the offense occurred. There was a  
23 time frame.

24 A The time frame, original time frame was August of



1 1998 to August of 2000, and that was changed by way of  
2 Mr. Clifton at the preliminary hearing to August 13th --  
3 August 14th, excuse me, August 14th of 1998 to August 13th  
4 of 1999.

5 Q Did you have any other belief from any other  
6 party, any other person, that probation was available for  
7 this particular charge?

8 A I just took the word of my attorney at the time.

9 Q Did you happen to be in court when the district  
10 attorney's office took the position?

11 A I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

12 Q Were you in court at the time that the deputy DA  
13 took the position that probation might be available?

14 A Yes, I was.

15 Q And what did you learn from that?

16 A Well, I left the courtroom under the belief that  
17 if I kept to my side of the contract, that probation would  
18 be available.

19 Q Did you discuss the elements of the crimes with  
20 Mr. O'Mara?

21 A I discussed the allegations with him briefly,  
22 yes.

23 Q And were you convinced that you would be found  
24 guilty of this crime?



1 Q Okay. Do you deny that you had sexual contact  
2 with Ashley?

3 A I do.

4 Q And you deny you had sexual contact with Jessica,  
5 too, correct?

6 A I do.

7 Q In that case, can you reconcile that position  
8 with statements you made to the police and Mr. Ing and in  
9 preparing for the sentencing and police investigation?

10 A It was just that, preparing for sentencing. I  
11 was --

12 Q Again --

13 A I'm answering, Mr. Hatlestad.

14 Q How do you reconcile that?

15 A I'm answering your question, sir.

16 Q Go ahead.

17 A First of all, with Mr. Ing and with the  
18 investigation for sentencing, as you say, it was the  
19 requirement that I admit the guilt.

20 Q So you lied.

21 A I had already -- I had already admitted guilt,  
22 Mr. Hatlestad.

23 Q Well, let me just ask it, then. You lied to  
24 Mr. Ing?

1           A     I did -- I presented what I was supposed to  
2 present to present as a viable candidate for probation. I  
3 had already entered a plea of guilty, sir.

4           Q     My question is very simple. Did you lie to  
5 Mr. Ing about having sexual contact with Ashley? Did you  
6 lie to him about that?

7           A     I approached with my counselor what was needed  
8 by -- what was required, what my attorney required me to  
9 do.

10           MR. HATLESTAD: Your Honor, would you please  
11 direct the witness to answer the question.

12           THE COURT: You have to answer the question.  
13 Whether you want to call it a lie or you didn't tell the  
14 truth, the words are not important, but you are not  
15 answering the question.

16           THE DEFENDANT: Okay. My discussions with  
17 Mr. Ing were made in conforming with my plea.

18           MR. HATLESTAD: Your Honor, I would again ask --

19           THE COURT: You're not answering the question.  
20 He's not asking you whether you were in conformity with  
21 the plea.

22           THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

23           THE COURT: He's saying: Did you lie to him --

24           THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I did.

1 BY MR. HATLESTAD:

2 Q Okay. Did you lie to Detective Broome when it  
3 came to your discussions and description of what happened  
4 with Jessica?

5 A Yes.

6 Q What part?

7 A Any sexual contact whatsoever.

8 Q So as I recall your statement to Detective  
9 Broome, she came on to you, she unzipped your pants, she  
10 pulled your penis out, and she gave or tried or started to  
11 give you oral sex. Is that true? Is that what happened  
12 with Jessica?

13 A No.

14 Q So you lied to Detective Broome, too?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Why did you lie to him?

17 A Detective Broome entered the room with the  
18 booking he had already filled out. Detective Broome  
19 entered the room with the booking sheet filled out, all  
20 ready, with the intent to take me into custody.

21 Q He didn't take you into custody.

22 A Yes, he did. Yes, he did.

23 Q Okay. So you lied to him because he was going to  
24 arrest you anyway?

1           Just trying to get to the bottom of it.

2           Wasn't the idea here that you wanted to make it  
3 sound consensual so there wouldn't be an arrest for a  
4 crime --

5           A    No, I knew there was nothing there.

6           Q    Well, you basically said there was no crime here  
7 because you did not commit an act, right? She's the  
8 actor, not you.

9           A    I didn't say that.

10          Q    Well, I know you didn't say it because I've got  
11 it right here in front of me.

12          A    I don't recall the conversation without looking  
13 at it.

14          Q    Okay. Well, you said she came on to you and  
15 unzipped your pants, took out your penis, and began to  
16 perform oral sex. You're telling us today that that is a  
17 lie.

18          A    Yes.

19          Q    So the fact that there's no foreign DNA on your  
20 penis pursuant to this DNA test would be consistent with  
21 your lie.

22          A    Yes.

23          Q    Or inconsistent with your lie.

24          A    It would be consistent with the truth.

1 Q Okay. Well, that's --

2 A Which was not what --

3 Q That's kind of what we're up to.

4 So you have got lies to Mr. Ing. You got lies to  
5 Detective Broome. And I suspect that you probably lied to  
6 Judge Steinheimer during your guilty plea, too, right?

7 A I was advised by my client (sic) to say yes to  
8 what was asked.

9 Q Well, that's not exactly what happened, is it?

10 A Is that a question?

11 Q Yes, it is. You didn't say yes to every question  
12 that was asked you, did you?

13 A I don't -- it's 36 pages long. Which part are  
14 you talking about?

15 Q I'm talking about several parts. We'll go  
16 through it.

17 A Let's go.

18 Q Just to be clear, Mr. O'Mara did not say to you:  
19 Brendan, when the judge asks you a question, you say yes.  
20 He did not do that in this case, did he?

21 A When Mr. O'Mara gave me --

22 MR. HATLESTAD: Your Honor, that's a simple yes  
23 or no question.

24 THE COURT: I think it is, Mr. Dunckley.

1           Mr. Dunckley, you are very, very bright, and you  
2 have spent a lot of time on your case. But isn't doing  
3 you any good to not cooperate and answer the questions  
4 directly.

5           THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

6           THE COURT: It's making you seem evasive.

7           THE DEFENDANT: I understand. I apologize, Your  
8 Honor.

9           THE COURT: Well, it's not really an apology.  
10 I'm just telling you, number one, I'm going to make you  
11 answer the questions.

12          THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

13          THE COURT: And, number two, I'm advising you  
14 it's not doing your cause any good.

15          THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.

16          THE COURT: Would you repeat the question,  
17 please, Mr. Hatlestad.

18          MR. HATLESTAD: I will, Your Honor.

19 BY MR. HATLESTAD:

20          Q     Mr. O'Mara did not say to you: Brendan, answer  
21 yes to every question Judge Steinheimer asks you. Did he?

22          A     Not every question, no.

23          Q     Did he tell you to answer -- did he tell you to  
24 tell the truth? Did he tell you not to tell the truth?



1           A     Neither.  He just told me that to admit -- to  
2 take the deal and do what's asked.

3           Q     Okay.  So my question to you is --

4           A     I am answering.

5           Q     We're building up to it.  When Judge Steinheimer  
6 asked the questions during the guilty plea, you told the  
7 truth, or did you not tell the truth, when you answered  
8 those questions?

9           A     With the questions of the allegations, I told  
10 what I was -- I agreed to what the charge was, yes.

11          Q     Okay.  Was that true?

12          A     What the allegations were, and that I did -- that  
13 I was a principal in the issues?

14          Q     Yes.

15          A     No, that was not true.

16          Q     So you told the truth some of the time to get the  
17 deal, and then you lied other times because it didn't  
18 matter.

19          A     Honestly, I don't know how to answer that  
20 question, sir.

21          Q     We're trying to figure out whether we should  
22 believe you or not.  You have already admitted you lied to  
23 Mr. Ing.  You admitted you lied to the detective.

24                 Now, the next question is did you lie to Judge

1 Steinheimer at your plea, and ultimately you're lying now.

2 So let's go through your guilty plea. If you  
3 need a copy to follow, I've got one.

4 THE COURT: Do you want to follow the written  
5 transcript?

6 THE DEFENDANT: Please.

7 MR. HATLESTAD: I was going to use this one, Your  
8 Honor, but I have another, so we can mark this one.

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MR. HATLESTAD: Can we use this one for  
11 Mr. Dunckley?

12 THE COURT: Yes, I have it.

13 THE CLERK: Exhibit A marked.

14 (Exhibit No. A marked.)

15 THE COURT: And would you read the title,  
16 Ms. Clerk.

17 THE CLERK: This is the transcript of the plea,  
18 Motion to Confirm Trial, Thursday, March 6th, 2008.

19 THE COURT: I have that on my computer now.

20 BY MR. HATLESTAD:

21 Q I'll cite the pages and the lines, if that will  
22 help.

23 A Thank you, sir.

24 Q Okay. On that transcript, flip over to page

1 five. Go down to line ten. Actually line seven.

2 Mr. O'Mara is reciting the plea bargain there, and it  
3 says:

4 "In exchange for his plea of guilty, Your  
5 Honor, the State and counsel and  
6 Mr. Dunckley have agreed to recommend the  
7 following: The State will be free to argue  
8 for the appropriate sentence."

9 Do you remember that?

10 A I do.

11 Q And then on the next page, the Court asks you, on  
12 line two: "Mr. Dunckley, do you understand these  
13 negotiations?"

14 And you said, "Yes."

15 Correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay. So the State is free to argue, and yet  
18 your contention here is they breached the plea agreement,  
19 right?

20 A (No audible response.)

21 Q Please explain that.

22 A Well, my contention is, Mr. Hatlestad, that just  
23 because the State reserved the right to argue did not  
24 allow Ms. Vilorio the right to disavow and circumvent the

1 deal.

2 Q Well, she's free to argue, right?

3 A She is free to argue for sentence, absolutely,  
4 but she's not allowed to argue adamantly for the one  
5 consideration that I viewed as an important factor.

6 Q Please cite in the record where it says that.

7 A Where it cites in the record that she's not  
8 allowed to disavow the deal?

9 Q Well, she didn't disavow the deal because the  
10 deal was free to argue. If there's another term or  
11 condition, please cite it from the record, sir.

12 A By her comments on -- at the change of plea  
13 hearing, at the close of hearing, where she allowed for  
14 the probation and led me to believe the availability of  
15 the probation, but then by her arguing -- then her arguing  
16 adamantly for no form of probation, and not only that, her  
17 arguing for the maximum sentence, which she was allowed to  
18 do, but at that point, it became an illusory deal.

19 Q Your belief is her comment at the end changed the  
20 negotiation?

21 A I believe that her comments and actions were  
22 equally as -- could be construed equally as fraud by her  
23 actions and comments as much the written word, yes.

24 Q Even though she's free to argue?

1           A     Even though she's free to argue, she's not  
2 legally allowed to disavow and circumvent the contract.  
3 And what we --

4           Q     The contract is free to argue, sir. That's where  
5 we're having the problem here. It's free to argue. If  
6 her position at the end of the plea hearing is that you're  
7 worthy of probation and then later argues that you're not,  
8 then her position is you're not worthy of probation and  
9 she's free to argue, correct?

10          A     Well, I agree, but my question is --

11          Q     Thank you. Next question: "Sir, did you read  
12 the guilty plea memorandum?" And you said, "Yes."

13                   Is that true?

14          A     What page are you on, sir?

15          Q     I'm on page six, line ten. Is that a true  
16 statement?

17          A     Yes.

18          Q     "Do you have any questions about the document?"

19                   "Answer: No."

20                   Is that correct?

21          A     Yes.

22          Q     And just for completeness: "Do you have any  
23 questions about the modification on the typed document?"

24                   And you said, "No."

1           Is that correct?

2           A     Yes, I said that.

3           Q     On page eight, the judge is asking you about  
4     Count I and Count II. Line 15. This is in reference to  
5     Count I: "Did you do what it says you did in that  
6     charge?"

7                     And your answer is, "Yes."

8                     That I assume is false.

9           A     Yes, it was.

10          Q     So that's one lie, correct? Can we agree with  
11     that?

12          A     Yes, that's agreed.

13          Q     "And what about Count II?"

14                     "Yes, ma'am.

15                     "Do you understand that charge?"

16                     "Yes, ma'am, I do.

17                     "Did you do what it says you did in that charge?"

18                     And you answered, "Yes."

19                     And that is a false statement, correct?

20          A     Yes.

21          Q     On page 11, line four, the Court asks: "Has  
22     anyone made threats to get you to enter these pleas?"

23                     And you said, "No."

24                     Is that true?

1 A Yes.

2 Q "Has anyone told you that you would be guaranteed  
3 probation or any particular result?"

4 And you said, "No."

5 A That's correct.

6 Q "Has anyone made any promises or representations  
7 to you to get you to enter these pleas that you haven't  
8 told me about?"

9 And you said, "No."

10 A Correct.

11 Q "Do you have any doubt about what you're doing  
12 here today?"

13 And you said, "No."

14 Is that true?

15 A Yes.

16 Q That's true?

17 A That I had no doubt what I was doing there that  
18 day, that's true.

19 Q That's true?

20 A Yeah.

21 Q Okay. All right. Okay. Good.

22 Now, did you ever live in Washoe County at or  
23 about the time these offenses were alleged?

24 A Which offense, sir?

1 Q Well, the two we're here on. The offense --

2 A Over a ten-year period of time.

3 Q Okay.

4 A Each count.

5 Q When did you move to the county, sir?

6 A I didn't move to Washoe until 2000.

7 Q So prior to 2000, you had never been in Washoe  
8 County; is that correct?

9 A That is correct.

10 Q Never set foot here?

11 A I have driven past, through on the way to  
12 California on 80, but never stopped or set foot in Washoe  
13 County, no.

14 Q So when Ashley says you lived here, had a house  
15 or a residence here, that's false?

16 A That is correct.

17 Q You discussed this with your lawyer?

18 A I did.

19 Q What did he say?

20 A It didn't matter.

21 Q Is that a quote? I'm going to ask him.

22 A I don't remember the exact conversation, but I  
23 remember he said it didn't matter.

24 Q Well, certainly, if you're saying to him, look, I



1 didn't -- I didn't live here when these offenses happened,  
2 he says it didn't matter, I'm having a hard time believing  
3 you didn't argue with him on that.

4 So tell me you argued with him and tell me what  
5 you said to him.

6 A I told him that I had proof and documentation  
7 that I did not even reside in the state.

8 Q And he accepted all of that?

9 A He accepted all the documents, yes.

10 Q And what did he say about it?

11 A Nothing further after that.

12 Q Just accepted them?

13 A Just took the documents and never brought it up  
14 again.

15 Q Okay. But you were living in Washoe County at  
16 the time of the offense with Jessica, correct?

17 A Yes, I was.

18 Q Where were you living?

19 A I was living on Highplains Drive.

20 Q Highplains?

21 A Yes, sir, one word.

22 Q Highplains. What part of town is that in?

23 A I believe it's northwest.

24 Q Okay. Now, you don't deny being with Jessica

1 that night, correct?

2 A Having contact with Jessica, no, I do not.

3 Q There were plenty of witnesses around.

4 A Yes, there were.

5 Q So there's no point in denying that. And there's  
6 no witnesses to events that happened inside the building,  
7 right, except you and her?

8 A Correct.

9 Q And your big thing about the offense with Jessica  
10 is there were no evidence of bite marks, right?

11 A And no DNA.

12 Q Well, the DNA we have a statement from you that  
13 says she put her mouth on your penis. We have that,  
14 right? So the fact --

15 A Well, that was --

16 Q Well, we have it, right? It's right here.

17 A We've already established that was a lie.

18 Q Well, I know. That's what you have established.  
19 That's what you've said.

20 A I believe you established that also as a lie.

21 Q What we have here is you have been making a  
22 statement to a police officer saying: I had oral sex with  
23 Jessica.

24 A I understand. We've already established ten

1 minutes ago that was a lie. And you established my  
2 credibility on that was a lie.

3 Q Right. So how did you expect to get before the  
4 jury the notion that you were not guilty of this offense  
5 with this statement?

6 A Well, I brought that to my attorney with the  
7 discussion -- I discussed that briefly with my attorney on  
8 the fact that morning of the preliminary hearing is the  
9 fact that when -- excuse me, when I was interviewed or  
10 interrogated by Detective Broome, at no time was I  
11 Mirandized.

12 Q Where did the interview happen?

13 A At the police department interrogation of a sex  
14 offender unit.

15 Q How did you get there?

16 A I drove there.

17 Q Okay. Did that on your own, did you?

18 A I did.

19 Q Okay.

20 A It didn't negate the fact that I felt I was in  
21 custody.

22 Q Well, we all understand that, but the fact of the  
23 matter is you came down on your own. You were told you  
24 were free to leave and not under arrest --

1           A     It didn't negate his responsibility to Mirandize  
2 me, which is on the top of their letterhead, on the top of  
3 the Miranda papers.

4           Q     That's only if you're in custody.

5           A     I was in custody and I asked him on the record.  
6 I asked him on the record if Ms. -- if Detective Broome  
7 had any intention of letting me walk out the door, and he  
8 said no.

9           Q     Okay. Now, you discussed this motion to suppress  
10 with counsel, right?

11          A     No. I didn't know that it was a motion to  
12 suppress. I just simply asked if the fact that I was not  
13 Mirandized was relevant, and he said it didn't matter if I  
14 was Mirandized or not.

15          Q     Either Mr. O'Mara loves the statement "it didn't  
16 matter," or you're just paraphrasing. So which is it?

17          A     Well, that phrase and also the fact that his only  
18 strategy was: I can buy you enough time to get your  
19 family ready for prison.

20          Q     I like how you're adding to the story. When did  
21 that happen?

22          A     I'm simply answering the questions, sir.

23                 It happened every time I spoke to him on the  
24 phone. And every time we left the court -- every time we

1 left the court appearances on the preliminary hearing on  
2 July 2nd, and then further on -- when I met with him one  
3 other time. He said that he can try and go for a deal and  
4 get us a deal and push off the State long enough to get my  
5 family ready for prison financially -- excuse me,  
6 financially stable for prison.

7 Q Okay. All right. So the way you see the defense  
8 of your case going if it had gone to trial is you would  
9 try and make a motion to suppress this statement to  
10 Broome.

11 A I can't -- I can't count of what a strategy, a  
12 legal strategy was, 'cuz no one would discuss with me --

13 MR. HATLESTAD: Your Honor --

14 THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Hatlestad, the difference  
15 between me now and me three years ago in my legal  
16 knowledge is substantial. Three years ago I had no idea  
17 of any of the protocol or establishments of a courtroom.  
18 BY MR. HATLESTAD:

19 Q Well, your view when you wrote this petition you  
20 were corroborating, which is you would not have pleaded  
21 guilty, your lawyer would have done a better  
22 investigation, you would have gone to trial and been  
23 acquitted, right?

24 A For clarification, had my attorney done any

1 investigation, it would have made a difference. Had I  
2 known the evidence I know now and had I known the  
3 information I know now, yes, I would have been more than  
4 confident to go to trial. But at the time I was --

5 Q To put a fine point on it, you would have pleaded  
6 not guilty to the major offenses.

7 A Yes.

8 Q You would have tried to get this statement to  
9 Broome suppressed or excluded, right?

10 A If that's what it's called, yes.

11 Q It's called excluded, suppressed.

12 A Okay.

13 Q You would have brought this DNA report before the  
14 jury and said: Hey, no foreign DNA. It's just me.  
15 There's no bite marks.

16 A I would think that's relevant, yes.

17 Q So the offense with Jessica never happened  
18 despite what I said with Mr. Broome.

19 A I would think that that would be relevant, yes.  
20 That would be important.

21 Q How exactly did you expect to get on the record  
22 evidence contradicting Jessica's statement that she --  
23 that you had her perform oral sex on you outside the bite  
24 mark?

1 A Can you rephrase the question?

2 Q Yeah, let me rephrase that.

3 Jessica would testify against you that there was  
4 oral sex performed on you.

5 A Mm-hmm.

6 Q Despite what this DNA test shows.

7 A Well, I was under the impression -- I'm under the  
8 impression now, that I didn't know then, that it was the  
9 State's duty to present that exculpatory evidence forward  
10 pursuant to statute.

11 Q No. Our duty to is present it to your lawyer,  
12 and we did that. He had it in the file.

13 A If I --

14 THE COURT: Let's not -- no. I'm not going to  
15 listen to a debate.

16 THE DEFENDANT: That's why -- I'm stopping now,  
17 Your Honor. Thank you.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 THE DEFENDANT: No problem.

20 MR. HATLESTAD: I'll move on, Your Honor.

21 BY MR. HATLESTAD:

22 Q Just to complete the circle, you have three  
23 meetings with Mr. O'Mara. The first is the prelim.

24 A Yes.

1 Q And then you're on bail.

2 A Yes.

3 Q Does he call you on the phone or are you calling  
4 him?

5 A I believe we touched base on the phone, yes.

6 Q Did you tell him what your defense was to these  
7 offenses?

8 A At the preliminary hearing, yes, I did.

9 Q At the preliminary hearing.

10 A Yes.

11 Q Did you tell him in complete or is was it a  
12 shorthand version?

13 A At the time I didn't know about the DNA. I told  
14 him about the information and the documentation I had for  
15 Ashley's charge.

16 Q Okay. And you brought all that documentation you  
17 rattled off at the prelim, right?

18 A Yes, I did.

19 Q You told him your defense to Count No. II, or the  
20 other charge, right, with Jessica?

21 A I didn't tell him anything on that one. I had no  
22 argument. Just simply stated my side.

23 Q Just so we're clear, what more did you want  
24 Mr. O'Mara to investigate on the Ashley charge beside



1 those documents?

2 A It would have been helpful if he had spoken to  
3 her and/or verified and confirmed -- and confirmed the  
4 doc -- and verified and confirmed the documentation's  
5 authenticity.

6 Q Anything else?

7 A That's all I could think of at this time.

8 Q Okay. And what did you want Mr. O'Mara to  
9 investigate on the Jessica charge?

10 A The consistency of the statements.

11 Q I'm sorry?

12 A The consistencies of her statements.

13 Q Okay.

14 A The fact, after the preliminary hearing, how the  
15 apartment -- the condition of the apartment and the doors.  
16 At no time, to my knowledge, did he ever visit the  
17 apartment or speak to Jessica at all. And I would like  
18 for him to have interviewed Jessica.

19 Q And we had no idea if she would talk to him,  
20 right?

21 A I don't know, sir.

22 Q Is she going to testify here or is Ashley going  
23 to testify?

24 A I couldn't speak on that.

1 Q So we're going to have no idea what these people  
2 would have said to your lawyer, right?

3 A (No audible response.)

4 MR. HATLESTAD: Okay. Okay. Thank you, sir.

5 THE COURT: Mr. Story?

6 MR. STORY: Thank you, Your Honor.  
7

8 **REDIRECT EXAMINATION**

9 BY MR. STORY:

10 Q Once you received the file from Mr. O'Mara, you  
11 reviewed it; is that correct?

12 A Yes, I did.

13 Q And you found things in that file that you didn't  
14 know about prior to entering your plea; is that correct?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q And what are those things?

17 A The -- specifically the DNA and the lack of any  
18 investigation and/or strategy, for that matter.

19 Q Had you known that prior to entering your plea,  
20 would you have entered your plea?

21 A No.

22 Q Now, you said that you lied to the Court and  
23 admitted guilt in this case; is that correct?

24 A Yes, I did.

1 Q Was that at the advice of your counsel?

2 A It was.

3 Q Was that true at the time?

4 A No.

5 Q So you just followed your attorney's advice; is  
6 that correct?

7 A He told me to answer in the affirmative to all  
8 questions pertaining to the charges.

9 Q And you requested that your attorney investigate  
10 this case; is that correct?

11 A Yes, I did.

12 Q To the best of your knowledge, he did not; is  
13 that also correct?

14 A Not to my knowledge.

15 MR. STORY: I have no further questions, Your  
16 Honor. Thank you.

17

18 **RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION**

19 BY MR. HATLESTAD:

20 Q Well, take a look at page 12 of that transcript,  
21 sir.

22 A (Witness complies.)

23 Q Line No. 10. Judge is asking you about pleading.

24 "Are you doing so of your own free will?"

1           And your answer is, "Yes."

2           Is that true or not?

3           A     It was under the advice of counsel that I  
4 answered yes. So at the time, it was in my best interest  
5 to do so. So yes.

6           Q     Well, I know, but it says: "Are you doing so of  
7 your own free will?"

8           A     It was my choice to enter the plea upon  
9 counsel -- I took the advice of counsel and made the final  
10 decision to enter the plea. So, yes, it was free will.

11           MR. HATLESTAD: All right. Nothing else.

12           THE COURT: You may step down, sir. Thank you.

13           THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.

14           MR. STORY: Your Honor, we have no further  
15 witnesses.

16           And if it's entirely possible, may I take a quick  
17 break? I've been taking some medication and I need --

18           THE COURT: Sure.

19           MR. STORY: -- to use the restroom. I apologize.

20           THE COURT: We'll take a short recess. Court's  
21 in recess.

22                   (Recess taken.)

23           THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.

24           Okay. Mr. Story, you have no witness?

1 MR. STORY: That's correct, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Mr. Hatlestad?

3 MR. HATLESTAD: I'd like to call Mr. O'Mara.

4 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. O'Mara, please come  
5 forward and be sworn.

6  
7 **DAVID O'MARA,**  
8 called as a witness by the State,  
9 having been first duly sworn, was examined  
10 and testified as follows:

11  
12 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

13 BY MR. HATLESTAD:

14 Q State your name and spell your last name.

15 A My name is David O'Mara, O apostrophe, capital  
16 M-A-R-A.

17 Q And what is your occupation and profession?

18 A I'm an attorney here in Reno.

19 Q Are you licensed to practice law here in Nevada?

20 A I'm licensed to practice in all courts in the  
21 state of Nevada.

22 Q Did you have occasion to represent Mr. Dunckley  
23 here?

24 A Yes. I did represent Mr. Dunckley on various

1 charges in both the Justice Court here in Washoe County  
2 and District Court.

3 Q Okay. First of all, why don't you tell us how  
4 that came about, how you were appointed or received --

5 A I was part of the Jack Alian group, and I took  
6 various cases per -- and I was paid \$3,000 for six cases,  
7 I think, a month, and Mr. Dunckley was one of my cases.

8 Q Now, prior to taking Mr. Dunckley's case, had you  
9 ever had any other sex cases?

10 A Yes. I probably had handled three or four sex  
11 cases at that time or was in the process of handling a few  
12 of those cases. And most of those were with the ADA  
13 Ms. Viloría.

14 Q Now, Mr. Dunckley has said very clearly the first  
15 time the two of you talked was at his preliminary hearing;  
16 is that correct?

17 A I don't recall if that's really true, but that's  
18 probably likely that the first time that we had  
19 discussions was probably that afternoon.

20 I don't remember if there was a continuance.  
21 Normally there is a continuance in regards to some cases,  
22 and then set it out for another date, but I cannot recall  
23 that happening in this case. I just don't know.

24 Q Do you remember, was it at the preliminary

1 hearing or the day of that preliminary hearing that  
2 Mr. Dunckley laid out his defenses or his version of these  
3 offenses to you?

4 A He did say that they did not occur. And so I  
5 don't really think that that would be an accurate  
6 portrayal of what actually occurred at the preliminary  
7 hearing in regards to what are his defenses.

8 We did discuss the fact that he was not there in  
9 Nevada for the other one.

10 There were also some discussions because there  
11 was another girl. I don't remember her name off the top  
12 of my head. There were numerous charges. I believe there  
13 was 17 charges or some odd in the Justice Court. And I'd  
14 have to look at the filing document to find out how many  
15 charges were set.

16 And so we talked about that very -- you know.  
17 And we went in, and many of the charges were dismissed,  
18 one because one of them didn't show up. But there were  
19 also sexual coercion charges as well that were also  
20 dismissed in the lower court, Justice Court.

21 I don't believe at that time that he gave me any  
22 documentation at all that day. He did make that  
23 mention -- there was no question in my mind that he said  
24 that he was not in this area.

1           But one of the documents he provided was a  
2 transcript of his culinary union, and he had to obtain  
3 that document, so I'm fairly confident that that did not  
4 happen that day.

5           And some in some of my notes, I did ask for  
6 additional documents. I have letters that I had provided  
7 him asking for additional notes throughout the period of  
8 time of my representation. And so I believe that he  
9 provided me some of those things throughout the entire  
10 period of my representation of him.

11           Q     Now, Mr. Dunckley was on bail during the periods  
12 of time, correct?

13           A     That's correct.

14           Q     Was he having any trouble getting ahold of you?  
15 Are you noticing it or is he complaining about lack of  
16 contact?

17           A     Mr. Dunckley would not have any contact with me  
18 basically. I on numerous occasions had to send him  
19 letters, call him, and try to get him in. He was very  
20 unavailable at most times, even up until the last day of  
21 his sentencing.

22                   When I asked him for various information and to  
23 meet with me, he still found a way to not meet with me  
24 until very shortly before any hearing.



1           Q     Are you questioning him about this, like: We  
2 need to get together?

3           A     Oh, absolutely. We met on numerous occasions.  
4 And one specific time we met, we went over all of the  
5 taped interviews in regards to him. And we also went  
6 over -- I'm not sure if there was a video as well, but I  
7 think there was a video deposition that we also went over.

8                     So we met on numerous occasions. We went over  
9 various things. And I could give you -- I'll let you ask  
10 the question, then I'll give you more specifics as we go.

11          Q     All right. Let's put it this way: In addition  
12 to talking to Mr. Dunckley about the various facts and  
13 circumstances of the offense and getting his account,  
14 you're pursuing discovery from the State, right?

15          A     That's correct. In fact, I sent numerous letters  
16 to Ms. Viloría because I believed that I was not getting  
17 all of the information. And specific, I do believe -- and  
18 I don't -- I really have not reviewed anything  
19 Mr. Dunckley has filed in the writ, what information he  
20 has done, but this morning I did go through my file and  
21 did find I think two letters to Ms. Viloría saying that I  
22 needed certain information from her that I had not gotten.  
23 Some were the audiotapes and some of it was the  
24 documentary evidence as well because Mr. Dunckley was

1 telling me that the -- the DNA was a big issue. Not  
2 having that document was a big issue.

3 And he knew and we had talked about the fact  
4 that -- whether or not if that document came back with DNA  
5 on his private parts, that would obviously be very  
6 difficult to overcome. But also, if that document came  
7 back and there was nothing on there as he was going to  
8 claim there was, we still had some problems and there were  
9 still some serious risks for him going to trial on the  
10 sexual assault charge of Ms. Jessica.

11 Q Okay. As far as that DNA report is concerned,  
12 did you show that to Mr. Dunckley before his plea?

13 A I don't know if I showed that to him, but we did  
14 discuss the fact that there was nothing on that DNA test.  
15 And that went into the equation of whether or not he was  
16 going to plead guilty.

17 Q And what was the ultimate conclusion of that?

18 A Mr. Dunckley decided to not take my advice and go  
19 to trial, and he accepted a plea deal that was offered by  
20 the State because he believed that there was no chance  
21 that Judge Steinheimer would not give him probation and  
22 that Judge Adams would specifically write him a letter of  
23 recommendation and many hundreds of letters would be  
24 coming in as to his credibility in this community.

1           Q     Okay.  So rewind just a little bit.  You  
2 conducted -- or correct me if I'm wrong.  You tell me.

3                     You conducted a pretty thorough and complete  
4 investigation of the case, including discovery and  
5 conversations with your client, and you have concluded  
6 this case should go to trial, correct?

7           A     That's correct.

8           Q     And you discussed that with Mr. Dunckley.  And  
9 your view is -- or you're telling us today that upon  
10 telling Mr. Dunckley that, he is not inclined to take the  
11 case to trial but take a plea bargain which apparently you  
12 negotiated in the meantime; is that correct?

13          A     The method and what happened was that we were  
14 preparing for trial.  There was no question in my mind we  
15 were going to trial.  I believed in our defenses in  
16 regards to Count I.  I was not as confident in Count II  
17 which was the sexual assault charge, but Mr. Dunckley was  
18 moving me towards that position of trial.

19                     It was almost immediately when I gave him the  
20 offer that there was probation on the table that he was  
21 going to accept it, and I had to explain to him that that  
22 was probably not going to happen in this case, that he was  
23 going to have to spend some significant time in prison.

24                     And I reiterated that throughout the entire

1 process of him -- in regards to before he entered his  
2 guilty plea, and also after he entered guilty plea and  
3 before sentencing, that there was a likelihood that he was  
4 going to prison.

5 Q Well, if his attitude is, as you indicate that it  
6 is, he thinks for sure he's going to get probation in this  
7 case, for whatever reason, and you're telling him  
8 something that's 180 degrees opposite of that, can you  
9 identify any sort of tie-breaking issue, fact,  
10 circumstance that made him insist on taking the plea?

11 If he's over in one direction and you guys are  
12 completely separate and apart here and the twain does not  
13 meet, can you identify anything, any fact, circumstance,  
14 conversation that will convince a guy like Mr. Dunckley  
15 that says "I'm getting probation," and you're saying "No,  
16 you're not"?

17 A I have no idea why he would think he was going to  
18 get probation. I firmly believed he was not going to get  
19 probation, and I acknowledged that. I specifically told  
20 him that many times before the entry of guilt was entered  
21 on March 6th.

22 I mean, there's a lot of things that go into this  
23 case. I mean, he wouldn't have been probationable if he  
24 had gone to trial and been convicted. That was something

1 that came into play.

2 This case was very difficult to litigate. The  
3 main witness that I had, Mr. Dunckley -- if we went to  
4 trial, I probably would have subpoenaed her.  
5 Unfortunately, she had been moved to Ohio prior to any  
6 trial by Mr. Dunckley. And he adamantly refused to put  
7 his wife on the stand who he claimed would have been  
8 someone that could have helped him in regards to being an  
9 alibi since he claimed that he was on the phone with her  
10 during the incident with Jessica in the apartment.

11 And that was very -- I mean, that is a truth. I  
12 could not get access to his wife. He did not want me to  
13 talk to her. The first time I actually talked to her was  
14 I think in an e-mail after sentencing.

15 Q Did the e-mail discuss this alibi at all?

16 A No.

17 Q Okay. Well, let's rewind just a little bit.

18 When was the plea negotiation given to  
19 Mr. Dunckley, the first instance?

20 A Well, I'm not sure if he got -- it's probably  
21 true that he didn't get the actual document in regards,  
22 but this was a long, drawn-out period in which we were  
23 discussing the plea because we had to set up Dr. Ing, and  
24 that was set up in February. So he knew that he was --

1 needed to set up -- and he was getting letters from me  
2 talking about how Mr. Ing would accept him as a client to  
3 do these type of things.

4 So you know, this deal did not come like  
5 March 3rd and he was entering it on March 6th. There was  
6 a significant amount of time that he had with regards to  
7 that. And we talked to about it in that regard.

8 I don't know if I gave it to him that morning.  
9 If you look at the guilty plea memorandum, is it signed  
10 March 6th?

11 MR. HATLESTAD: The record will reflect it was  
12 signed on the 6th, Your Honor.

13 THE WITNESS: So that makes a lot of sense in  
14 regards to a guilty plea. A lot of times you don't get  
15 them until a day or two before the actual sentencing, so  
16 we go over it. But we have already -- I've already gone  
17 over all his constitutional rights before, before I even  
18 acknowledge to the district attorney that he's going to  
19 accept the deal.

20 BY MR. HATLESTAD:

21 Q Well, let me be a little more specific.

22 Mr. Dunckley signs the guilty plea memorandum on  
23 the 6th. Are you saying that he went over the guilty plea  
24 memorandum as a document in itself?

1           A     Oh, absolutely.

2           Q     That day?

3           A     We went over it and I sat down -- I just have  
4 this distinct image, now that I've been here, of  
5 Mr. Dunckley and I sitting outside on that wooden bench  
6 while he read it, and I asked him if he had any questions  
7 and specifically made sure that he knew that he waived all  
8 of those rights, that he was going to have to accept it  
9 and that he was going to have to admit to those charges.

10          Q     Okay. Now, Mr. Dunckley has said -- I want to  
11 come back to this plea in a minute.

12                     Mr. Dunckley has said that you essentially told  
13 him how to answer some questions in his plea canvass. Is  
14 that true?

15          A     Well, he said that I told him to say yes to  
16 everything. That's obviously not true. But in order to  
17 enter a guilty plea, you have to admit guilt to those  
18 charges. And so when I advised him, I said, "You need to  
19 tell the Court that you admit your guilt to these  
20 charges."

21                     He certainly was free to say: No, I'm not going  
22 to admit guilt to these charges. That would have charged  
23 the Court to not accept the guilty plea. So I don't think  
24 that --

1 Q Well, let's put a fine point on it. You're not  
2 telling him, are you, to admit to an offense he didn't  
3 commit, are you?

4 A No.

5 Q Well, be real clear about that because that's  
6 going to be an issue now.

7 A Right. But you never -- you never -- you never  
8 tell the client to admit to something that he did not do.  
9 But you're entering into a guilty plea, so he's looked at  
10 his case and we talked about what these elements are and  
11 what the guilty plea provides in regards to what he may be  
12 sentenced to, and he has to freely admit to those charges.  
13 If he does not admit to those charges, then he goes to  
14 trial.

15 Q Well, no. Well, here's the implication. The  
16 implication is you're telling him that: The judge will  
17 not accept your plea if you don't admit the elements.

18 And the implication is: I wouldn't do it if you  
19 hadn't told me to do that. That's what he's testified to  
20 in court today: I didn't want to admit to these things  
21 and I wouldn't have done it if you hadn't told me to do  
22 it.

23 A That's just not true.

24 Q Well, what happened then?



1           A     Well, I specifically told him not to take this  
2 deal because I thought that he was not going to get  
3 probation. And all I told him was if these are what you  
4 want to admit to, then you will be admitting to the guilt.

5                     But I never told him that if he was not guilty or  
6 if the allegations were not true, that he should say yes,  
7 those are true.

8           Q     Let me come back to the negotiation real quickly.

9                     Everything that's contained in this guilty plea  
10 memorandum you had gone over with Mr. Dunckley long before  
11 the document's presented to him; is that correct?

12           A     That's correct. Before he took the deal, I  
13 always go over the constitutional rights that the  
14 individual has and will be waiving.

15                     I also go over the rules in regards to what his  
16 sentencing could be and that the judge does not have to  
17 agree with any sentencing standards agreed to by the Court  
18 (sic).

19                     This case was a little bit different because we  
20 had the lewdness charges and we also had -- at the time,  
21 before the plea, he was charged with sexual assault of  
22 Jessica. And so we went over what it would be in regards  
23 to making a plea of an attempted sexual assault.

24                     And so we went forward, and those are all the --

1 I'm sure there were other issues that were discussed.

2 Q Now, as far as the negotiation itself is  
3 concerned, you have indicated, I think, if I understand  
4 you correctly, that the negotiation process was ongoing  
5 long before the entry of the plea; is that right?

6 A Well, it was ongoing at least -- I think the  
7 letters that I have are in the 20s of the February that we  
8 started discussing what he needed to do in order to  
9 satisfy that plea, so the plea would have started sometime  
10 in mid February.

11 Q So you're talking to Viloría and you're talking  
12 to your client about a deal in this case sometime in  
13 February.

14 A That's correct.

15 Q Several weeks before the plea, right?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q And had the negotiation always been what  
18 ultimately boiled down to the deal, or had there been  
19 other types of negotiations?

20 A I think Ms. Viloría had given me some other  
21 options. I think that if he would have pled to a sexual  
22 assault, I think that may have been the first offer. I  
23 don't recall.

24 Ms. Viloría is an attorney that I have always

1 found that will always try to negotiate a resolution,  
2 especially in sex cases. And she gives an offer and you  
3 can either accept it or go to trial with her.

4 And when she gave me her offer, we were going to  
5 trial. And so that's how I felt, that we were going to go  
6 forward. And then the offer came down as we -- I believe  
7 we had continued this trial before, one time before that  
8 we were ready to go and did not confirm it for some  
9 reason. I don't recall. And now, butting up on the new  
10 trial date, and that's when the offer came.

11 Q And then you discussed it with Mr. Dunckley, and  
12 he agrees to it because probation is on the table and his  
13 view is he's going to get probation in his estimation.

14 A That's correct.

15 Q Despite what you said.

16 A He rejected my recommendation that he not take  
17 this deal.

18 Q Okay. Now, aside from talking to Mr. Dunckley,  
19 and aside from getting discovery from the State, including  
20 the DNA result which you went over with your client, even  
21 though you didn't have the hard copy, and aside from  
22 getting the documents that he gave you, did you do any  
23 other kind of investigation of this case, or was reviewing  
24 and studying that material the sum and substance of what

1 you did?

2 A Sure. In regards to the Ashley case, I was very  
3 concerned in regards to her testimony, and I firmly  
4 believed that that would be a case that we could win. Not  
5 win, but we could receive an acquittal because there were  
6 a lot of misstatements in her characterizing.

7 And prior to the preliminary hearing, I  
8 investigated the Atlantis Casino. As you know, the  
9 Atlantis Casino has gone over some remodeling, and the  
10 Atlantis used to be a small hotel. And right around that  
11 time of the allegations, that's when I thought that the  
12 towers, the big long towers had not been put in.

13 And the allegation was that he had --  
14 Mr. Dunckley had fingered her on her private parts while  
15 she was either going up the elevator or coming down an  
16 elevator. So I went and I investigated that and  
17 unfortunately found that those towers were built prior to  
18 one of the allegations.

19 We reviewed all the transcripts. In regards to  
20 the Jessica, there was -- after we reviewed the  
21 transcripts, in looking at Mr. Dunckley's statements,  
22 there were some concerns in regards to her testimony on  
23 how this all occurred because if you recall from  
24 Mr. Dunckley's testimony -- and I can't remember if it was

1 the first time when Detective Broome came over to his  
2 house, and I think that was the first time that  
3 Mr. Dunckley admitted to some kind of sexual contact, or  
4 if it was the second time that he went down and was  
5 interviewed in regards to it.

6 But there was a lot of conflicting statements  
7 because Mr. Dunckley was claiming that he had at first  
8 walked into and was trying to help her into the room and  
9 she fell. And so he tried to get her up, and she was  
10 nonresponsive, so he rubbed her chest. And at that time  
11 she awakened and was so happy that she unzipped his pants  
12 and gave him oral sex.

13 That of course then changed because, as I recall,  
14 Detective Broome said, well -- and what I figured was a  
15 normal police tactic, which they always do, is: Well, why  
16 is there DNA on your penis? The second time was that  
17 Mr. Dunckley said: Well, what happened was, is she fell,  
18 she was choking on her throat, so I put my figure in and I  
19 swiped it through, saving her, and she woke up and was so  
20 happy that she performed oral sex on me.

21 And while they were standing out waiting for the  
22 cops and everything, he decided he was going to go to the  
23 bathroom. So when he used his hand to hold his penis  
24 going to the bathroom, that's when the DNA would have

1 | gotten onto his penis.

2 |           And so those statements were really hard to get  
3 | around. And obviously the DNA result was going to be --  
4 | if it -- those -- even if it came back as negative, we  
5 | were still going to have serious problems because of his  
6 | previous statements in regards to: Well, the DNA would be  
7 | on my penis because of the finger swap.

8 |           And so we reviewed all of those documents. I  
9 | continually asked for other documents.

10 |           During the preliminary hearing, I tried -- I had  
11 | Ms. Jessica give us a detailed description of her  
12 | apartment, and that conflicted with kind of her testimony  
13 | because her testimony was that she was already way in the  
14 | back of the building and there was a door that was a  
15 | problem.

16 |           And we were in the process of getting that  
17 | information from Ms. Viloría to go in and get a diagram of  
18 | the building, of the room that she had. That's what we  
19 | would have -- she -- I can't remember the exact details,  
20 | but she testified I think that she was in the back of her  
21 | house where there was a living room. On the right side  
22 | was -- or on the left side was a door to leave for the  
23 | balcony, but I think maybe it was the right side or  
24 | something of that nature. There were some discrepancies

1 of that. I think Mr. Dunckley alluded to there was some  
2 discrepancies in her testimony as to the layout of the  
3 apartment.

4 Q Okay. Well, given the importance of these  
5 statements that Mr. Dunckley gave to Detective Broome, did  
6 you consider a motion to suppress?

7 A I did consider a motion to suppress, but I didn't  
8 see that there was any -- that he did not voluntarily give  
9 them because the method in which he was freely giving  
10 statements the night -- when he was not in custody, and  
11 then the statements were given while he was at his own  
12 home, the first day he was at his home.

13 I think that that was becoming a big issue for  
14 Mr. Dunckley at the end because what was happening is that  
15 Ms. Viloría was then now claiming that she was going to  
16 bring in other charges on prior bad acts. At that time,  
17 we were reevaluating whether the suppression motion would  
18 have been available.

19 That's a mischaracterization because I don't  
20 think he was involved in any of my discussions of whether  
21 or not I was going to or not. So I just didn't feel that  
22 it was necessary in this case.

23 Q Well, did you -- you said you considered a motion  
24 to suppress but it wasn't necessary. Are you saying that

1 since there's two possible -- maybe more to suppress a  
2 statement, this statement that -- the key statement that  
3 Mr. Dunckley gave to Broome, the second statement, was it  
4 your view, after reviewing everything and conducting the  
5 investigation, sufficient depth and scope that  
6 Mr. Dunckley's statement was voluntarily under the  
7 *Jackson-Deno* standards? Did you think about that?

8 A I thought about whether it was voluntary, yes.  
9 And at the time that I -- in the beginning, when we were  
10 reviewing that, there was no mention from Mr. Dunckley  
11 that -- this is not the first time I heard about the  
12 booking sheet being on the desk, but the time that I heard  
13 about that was almost within a couple weeks of us entering  
14 into the plea.

15 That's why when I was talking about how we  
16 reevaluated that, that information was given to me by  
17 Mr. Dunckley later, later on in our review of what was  
18 going on.

19 So I had no idea that -- and I don't think that  
20 would have changed my decision anyway.

21 Q Okay. Well, if the statement is not involuntary,  
22 again, given the -- describe the scope and depth of your  
23 investigation to decide whether or not he was subjected to  
24 a custodial interrogation since the two inquiries are



1 separate and apart.

2 A It's my recollection that -- well, the first  
3 statement that he gave, he was -- he actually waited in  
4 his car, and I think that --

5 Q Well, let's put a fine point on it. Mr. Dunckley  
6 has stated very clearly here that he did not feel free to  
7 leave at that second interview. There's no question the  
8 first one is coming in.

9 A Yeah.

10 Q That one is coming in. I don't even think  
11 Mr. Story is going to contend it wouldn't. Maybe he will.

12 But the second one, Mr. Dunckley very clearly  
13 stated in this courtroom today under oath that he thought  
14 he was in custody. That's my word. He used different  
15 words.

16 A Right.

17 Q So what investigation did you do to alleviate the  
18 possibility that he was actually subject to a *Miranda*  
19 violation in this case and, therefore, that statement is  
20 out?

21 A Well, we reviewed those tapes because I believe  
22 that one was an audio, and I don't recall -- I really  
23 don't recall what Mr. Dunckley said in that specific  
24 testimony with Detective Broome at the sex crime unit, so

1 I can't really recall why I felt that there was no  
2 custodial charge. He was asked to go down there, from  
3 what I remember, and I think --

4 Q Hold on. He was voluntarily there. There's no  
5 question --

6 A I think he was entitled, if he wanted to leave at  
7 any time.

8 Q He's voluntarily there. Is he indicating to  
9 you -- and this is the point. This could be the case.  
10 This is the issue.

11 If this statement is out, his case is so much  
12 stronger. You got no DNA.

13 A He never --

14 Q Wait. You got no DNA. You got an incredible  
15 victim on one count, another victim whose story can't be  
16 backed up because there's no physical evidence, and then  
17 we have these damaging admissions he makes.

18 If they're subject to motion to suppress, your  
19 case is perceptibly better.

20 So my question to you, as a reasonably competent  
21 lawyer with some experience in these matters, is: Did you  
22 consider a *Miranda* violation in this case?

23 A It's my recollection that we did consider a  
24 *Miranda* violation in this case at two different periods of

1 time, and we concluded that the statements were made  
2 voluntarily and there was --

3 Q Not voluntary. Custodial.

4 A I was going to say: and that he was not under  
5 any custodial arrest.

6 Q And that's based on your review of the tape and  
7 talking to Ing, right?

8 A That is correct.

9 Q And he had not at this point said anything about  
10 the issue --

11 A That came in the second time that we were  
12 evaluating, but that became moot at the time that he said  
13 that he was going to accept the deal.

14 Q All right. Did you conduct any kind of  
15 investigation to authenticate the documents that  
16 Mr. Dunckley eventually gave you?

17 A The documents were provided to the district  
18 attorney's office. The key documents that we had in the  
19 beginning was his culinary.

20 Q What is that?

21 A It's his culinary transcript.

22 Q Oh, the culinary school.

23 A Yeah, the culinary school.

24 Q Okay.

1           A     And this was also -- those documents were  
2 provided to Ms. Viloría, which I think necessitated  
3 another -- because my discussions with her was: Look, you  
4 have nothing on Count I. My client wasn't here. Here is  
5 the proof.

6                     And throughout the period of time, I kept on -- I  
7 told Mr. Dunckley that the document was not a certified  
8 copy and I was under the impression that he was going to  
9 get me a certified copy, but I didn't really need that to  
10 be a certified copy because when I was in discussions with  
11 Ms. Viloría, there was really going to be no objection to  
12 those documents coming in.

13                    And Mr. Dunckley was very good because I told  
14 him, look, we have these documents, but then I distinctly  
15 remember him saying that he has other documents in regards  
16 to his defense. And so I told him to give them to me.

17                    And again, I had to actually write him a letter  
18 many weeks later saying: Where are these documents?

19                    And so we finally obtained I believe some tax  
20 records that would also have shown that he was not in the  
21 area during that period of time.

22           Q     Well, had your investigation uncovered  
23 information to suggest that he could have been here prior  
24 to August 13th of 2000?

1           A     I think that there was -- I think that he  
2 testified -- yeah. I think there was evidence that he was  
3 here for a period of time, and I believe he just testified  
4 today that he was here in 2000. And I don't recall what  
5 day, but I believe it was early 2000 that he moved here,  
6 like January of 2000. But I can't -- I don't recall.

7                     But he testified -- I do recall him testifying  
8 this morning that he had moved here in 2000, and he also  
9 talked about a Ford Taurus. I think that was bought in  
10 July of 2000 or -- I can't remember the Taurus car.

11           Q     Okay.

12           A     I mean, he probably has the DMV record in his  
13 file. So that would be -- that may be able to refresh my  
14 recollection.

15           Q     And the Taurus is a crime scene for Ashley.

16           A     That's my -- well, there was the allegation in  
17 regards to the Taurus sex, but there was also her making  
18 statements that while she was ascending or descending into  
19 the elevator that he had fondled her private parts.

20                     MR. HATLESTAD: Okay, that's all. Thank you,  
21 Mr. O'Mara.

22     ///

23     ///

24     ///

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. STORY:

Q Good morning.

A Good morning, Mr. Story. How are you this morning?

Q I'm great. You?

A Good.

Q If I understand the time of this correct, this sexual assault charge occurred about the time there was advertisement or common knowledge about Brianna Denison.

A That's correct.

Q Did that influence you in any way?

A Yes, it did.

Q Did you talk to Mr. Dunckley about the Brianna Denison case?

A I don't think -- yes, I did, but I expanded on the Brianna Denison case as well.

Q Why do you think Brianna Denison had any impact whatsoever on Mr. Dunckley's case?

A It was really not about the Brianna Denison case. As an attorney, I have to look the facts of this case, and I have to look at what the judge normally does in these type of cases. I have to look at what the district attorney would allow us to do in regards to

1 trying to figure out what is the best method of going back  
2 doing this case.

3 I felt that the Brianna Denison case would be  
4 very hard because it was in the papers and I thought that  
5 if we went to trial, that would have some effect on our  
6 ability to receive an acquittal on the lewdness with a  
7 child case.

8 Q Did you inform Mr. Dunckley of that?

9 A Yeah. We talked about the fact that when you  
10 look at jurors, you have to look at the community as a  
11 whole, and the fact that as we were going through this  
12 process, the Brianna Denison case may have some effect.  
13 But I didn't say that -- I said it would have an effect.

14 Q Now, if I understood you correctly, you were part  
15 of the Jack Alian group.

16 A That's correct.

17 Q And how many cases did you have at this  
18 particular time? Do you recall?

19 A Open or how many cases have I done?

20 Q That you were actually working.

21 A Oh, probably three or four. The cases that I  
22 handled with Jack Alian's cases were -- at this time I was  
23 getting away -- or the Jack Alian group was being -- at  
24 this time the Jack Alian group was being discarded or

1 whatever. I can't think of the word, but they were  
2 setting up a new program with an administrator; and  
3 therefore, they were going to reclassify all of the cases.  
4 So I started to get out of the Jack Alian group in regards  
5 to the adult courts, so I was not taking that many.

6 Q Do you practice civil law also?

7 A I do.

8 Q How much of your practice is civil?

9 A My civil practice is probably about 65 percent.

10 Q How busy were you in your civil practice at this  
11 particular time?

12 A I had one big case that was going on at that  
13 time, but I wasn't very busy. There was no time that I  
14 was working past 9:00 to 5:00 on any day.

15 Q So there was nothing in your practice that  
16 prevented you from working with Mr. Dunckley.

17 A Quite the contrary. I worked quite a lot on this  
18 case to try to figure out a method of resolving this case  
19 and getting it prepared for trial.

20 Q How were you paid on this case?

21 A I was paid on a flat fee.

22 Q So it didn't matter whether you put in one hour  
23 or 1,000 hours, you were still paid the same; is that  
24 correct?



1           A     In regards to the pay, yes. It did not matter  
2 how much I worked.

3           Q     Did the Alian group allow you to petition the  
4 Court to hire an investigator?

5           A     I think I could have. If I needed an opportunity  
6 to investigate, that may have been something I could have  
7 done.

8           Q     Did you do that?

9           A     I did not feel it was necessary because I  
10 conducted my own investigation.

11          Q     And what did you do in terms of your own  
12 investigation?

13          A     In regards to the investigations, I like to go  
14 out to the scenes of the alleged crimes, look those over,  
15 review everything in that regard.

16                 In a lot of cases, when there's no testimony by  
17 the victims, we try to go and interview the victims and  
18 have them come in.

19                 In this case, we had the transcripts in regards  
20 to that, and so we felt -- I felt that that would have  
21 been sufficient for me to be able to use those transcripts  
22 to poke any holes in their testimony at trial.

23          Q     Did you cross-examine these victims at the  
24 preliminary hearing?

1 A Yes, I did.

2 Q Did you believe them?

3 A Did I believe them?

4 Q Yes.

5 A The girl -- the lewdness charge, I felt that we  
6 had a chance of acquittal.

7 The Jessica girl, I felt that she was very good  
8 on the stand. I did find some things that I thought that  
9 we would go over. It was very unclear.

10 She claimed that she was forced into having  
11 sexual intercourse with Mr. Dunckley, but she was like  
12 20 feet away from him when she testified that he was in  
13 the doorway when he -- excuse my language, but he said,  
14 "Suck my dick." And that's what she believed, that she  
15 would then walk forward and began to give him oral  
16 gratification.

17 Q Is this the young woman with the high blood  
18 alcohol content?

19 A Yes, that's correct. Yeah. My understanding, it  
20 was past .2. And so I felt that that was going to be  
21 something we would be able to use in regards to her  
22 actually making the affirmative walk to actually give  
23 sexual gratification.

24 Q At the time you took this case, you had done

1 three or four other cases of sexual assault; is that  
2 correct?

3 A I can't recall. I started taking cases in 2006  
4 with the Jack Alian group. At that time, I probably had  
5 taken three or four, maybe a few more sexual assault  
6 cases. I had done many, many more adult cases.

7 Q Are you a sole practitioner?

8 A At the time of this case, I had -- I was in  
9 practice with my brother and my father.

10 Q Did you discuss this case with any other  
11 attorney?

12 A I probably discussed it with especially my father  
13 numerous times. And I also have a very good network of  
14 criminal defense attorneys that I frequently discuss cases  
15 with and processes.

16 I take very -- I take pride in the fact that most  
17 cases, I'm pretty solid, and I try to find everything I  
18 can to make sure my client gets the representation he  
19 deserves. And that's what I believe I did in this case.

20 Q After reviewing this case, looking backward, do  
21 you think there's anything else you could have done on  
22 Mr. Dunckley's behalf?

23 MR. HATLESTAD: I'm going to object. That's not  
24 relevant.

1 THE COURT: Sustained.

2 BY MR. STORY:

3 Q You said you met with Mr. Dunckley numerous  
4 occasions. Do you recall how many times?

5 A Mr. Dunckley, it was very hard to get ahold of  
6 him and have him come in. So I finally was able to get  
7 ahold of him to come in and actually watch the tapes  
8 because the tapes were not very good for him, and I needed  
9 him to watch them and give me information.

10 He also came in couple other times so that we  
11 could discuss various issues, but I had no idea -- I mean,  
12 this was a few years ago, so I don't recall what we  
13 actually discussed.

14 I just want to say that I discussed the plea deal  
15 with him. I want to say that I discussed the process with  
16 him right after the preliminary hearing where he was able  
17 to pick up the discovery.

18 Q Did you approach Kelli Anne Vilorio, or did she  
19 approach you about a plea deal?

20 A She approached me about the plea deals, both of  
21 them. It was my understanding that we were going to  
22 trial. The only way -- the only way I would have  
23 approached a DA for a plea deal is if my client said: Get  
24 me probation. And I don't know if I -- I don't know if

1 that ever happened in Mr. Dunckley's case.

2 Q Now, did you discuss probation with Mr. Dunckley?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Did you believe probation was available with this  
5 lewdness with a minor?

6 A I believed that, in our discussions, that we were  
7 going to go back and use the law in regards to when  
8 probation was available at the time of the alleged  
9 offense.

10 Q And that was a discussion you had with the DA,  
11 Vilorina?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q Okay. And did she tell you whether or not she  
14 thought probation was available?

15 A That was a concern and that was -- the  
16 availability of probation for the lewdness and the  
17 availability of probation of taking the case from a sexual  
18 assault to an attempted sexual assault was the reasons why  
19 the plea was entered.

20 Q Even with probation available, from your  
21 perspective, you still thought that trial was more  
22 appropriate?

23 A There was no question in my mind that if  
24 Mr. Dunckley accepted this deal, was what I told him, that

1     probation was not going to be granted to him.

2             Q     Why do you say that?

3             A     Why do I say that?

4             Q     Yes.

5             A     Well, I took into consideration the charges that  
6     were there. There was a lewdness charge with a child. I  
7     took into consideration that there was a sexual assault,  
8     attempted sexual assault. I took into consideration the  
9     propensity of the judge that we were going to be in front  
10    of and what would happen. And I took into consideration  
11    my experience in regards to what had happened as well as  
12    discussing with other attorneys this matter.

13            Q     Now, you said you conducted your own  
14    investigation, apparently referred to that; is that  
15    correct?

16            A     Well, when you have an investigator, you have to  
17    rely on them. If I need an investigator, I will get one  
18    because if I need someone to testify in regards to  
19    anything that I find or anything that investigator finds.

20            Q     Now, you testified that you went to the Atlantis;  
21    is that correct?

22            A     That's correct.

23            Q     Did you go to any other crime scene?

24            A     I did not go into the building, but I do recall

1 driving -- what had happened with Mr. Dunckley was, I was  
2 really concerned -- and I don't remember -- I don't  
3 remember all the nature of going, but I was concerned  
4 about the fact that there was an allegation that  
5 Mr. Dunckley was driving down the street and there was  
6 this young girl walking and that she said, "I don't want  
7 to get in the car," and that he followed her, and then  
8 there was a method of where he parked so he could see her  
9 stumbling up the stairs, doing things of that nature.

10 And so I was concerned that whether or not the  
11 staircase may have been in the back or whether it was --  
12 the front door was in the front, and I don't -- I can't  
13 remember what it looks like anymore.

14 But I remember driving over to the apartment  
15 complex and looking at the outside area to make sure that  
16 the -- either the door to her -- may have been in the back  
17 or wouldn't have been seen. I just can't remember.

18 Q Anything else you did to investigate this case?

19 A I reviewed all the information and if there was  
20 any -- and continued to ask the district attorney for  
21 additional documents.

22 Q Now, you said that Mr. Dunckley provided you with  
23 what amounts to alibi evidence, that he wasn't here at  
24 that particular --

1           A     He provided me a few documents. That's correct.

2           Q     Did you do anything to follow up on those  
3 documents?

4           A     Like what?

5           Q     Did you compare the times that those documents  
6 showed him to be somewhere else at the times of the  
7 crimes?

8           A     Absolutely. I believed that that was one of the  
9 reasons why he should go to trial in regards to Count I.

10          Q     How many times did you talk to him about going to  
11 trial?

12          A     I have no idea. Three or four times. Even after  
13 the fact that he entered his guilty plea, I told him if he  
14 wanted me to file a motion to withdraw his guilty plea, we  
15 would go to trial. He then acknowledged that I should  
16 just try to get him probation.

17          Q     What did you do to try to get him probation?

18          A     Well, Mr. Dunckley, when he accepted probation,  
19 told me that he was going to get a letter of  
20 recommendation from Judge Adams, who is the Department 6  
21 judge here in the Second Judicial District Court.

22                 I also told him to get as many letters as he can  
23 from the community because that would show how he was in  
24 the community in regards to how he could handle himself on



1     probation. We then set up information in regards to  
2     Dr. Ing and I think Dr. Davis. There was another doctor  
3     in his evaluation.

4             After that particular point when we received the  
5     forms back, the actual information in regards to the  
6     reports, I then wrote him a letter saying: Here are some  
7     concerns. I need to talk to you about this. Please  
8     contact me.

9             And I don't recall him ever contacting me in  
10    regards to the psychosexual reports.

11            Q     Now, once he pleaded guilty and you talked to him  
12    about withdrawal of the pleas, did you have an assessment  
13    as to whether or not the judge would allow you to withdraw  
14    his pleas?

15            A     Yeah. I felt the judge would not allow him to.  
16    What I felt is that he would -- my thought was: Let's try  
17    to get a continuance and get a better evaluation, or he  
18    could file a motion to withdraw. I felt that if he filed  
19    his motion to withdraw, we would have to go back to the  
20    crimes that were alleged, which were four crimes. One was  
21    a sexual assault that was -- had a little bit more umph to  
22    it; and second, I thought that if he tried to withdraw  
23    because his real argument was that -- Parole and Probation  
24    was recommending prison, and I thought that that was going

1 to be a ground that if he made that argument would cause a  
2 little bit more concerns to the Court over him not taking  
3 responsibility for his actions.

4 Q Now, at some point you received from the DA's  
5 office the DNA report; is that correct?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q And what did that DNA report do for  
8 Mr. Dunckley's case in your opinion?

9 A Well, it showed that there was no DNA. It was  
10 inconclusive, is what I thought, is what I recall.

11 Q Did you provide Mr. Dunckley a copy of that DNA  
12 report prior to him entering the plea?

13 A I have no idea.

14 Q Did you talk to him about it prior to entering  
15 plea?

16 A Absolutely. And I phrase that -- I'm not sure if  
17 I phrased it as there was no DNA, but we discussed,  
18 because we had not gotten it yet, throughout the period of  
19 time what ramifications that would actually have on his  
20 case if it did come back as not conclusive.

21 And while it would have been very helpful to us  
22 in trial, it still was not going to be the smoking gun  
23 that was going to let him off because we had all these  
24 other statements and we had her testimony as well.

1           There was some damaging things in that regard,  
2 and I discussed it with him. And I said even if it comes  
3 back negative, these are our problems that we're going to  
4 have in trial. And he still wanted to take this case to  
5 trial -- I mean, still wanted to take the deal.

6           Q     Did you ever consider whether or not you should  
7 have either of the victims -- any of the victims  
8 psychologically examined?

9           A     I don't believe I would have been able to on  
10 the -- yes, I did evaluate whether or not evaluation -- a  
11 psychological evaluation would have been available.

12          Q     Did you do that?

13          A     We did not ask for that, no.

14          Q     Why not?

15          A     I don't recall. I don't think that I would have  
16 been able to in regards to the adult child -- or the  
17 adult, and I'm not sure if I would have been able to meet  
18 the standards, the *Abbott* standards of the psychological  
19 evaluation for the child. So it was never done.

20          Q     Have you ever seen a written report of the  
21 allegations for Ashley?

22          A     I have no idea. Is there a report in the  
23 discovery?

24          Q     Apparently not.

1 MR. STORY: Thank you. No further questions.

2 MR. HATLESTAD: No, thank you, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: May this witness be excused?

4 MR. HATLESTAD: Yes, Your Honor.

5 MR. STORY: Yes, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: You may step down.

7 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Mr. Hatlestad, is there any --

9 MR. HATLESTAD: Nothing further, thank you.

10 THE COURT: Mr. Story?

11 MR. STORY: No further evidence, no, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Okay. We have three minutes for  
13 argument. I don't know if you can get done in 15 minutes.

14 MR. STORY: Mr. Dunckley informed me that he  
15 really needs to use the restroom.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I have another criminal  
17 hearing with an in-custody at 1:00 o'clock. It could go  
18 on from 1:00 to 2:00, and then we'll be back on the record  
19 at 2:00 in this case.

20 MR. STORY: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Court's in recess.

22 (The noon recess was taken at 11:43 a.m.)

23

24

1 RENO, NEVADA, FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 2011, 2:06 P.M.

2 -oOo-

3  
4 THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.  
5 Counsel?

6 MR. STORY: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll be very  
7 brief. First, we'd like to thank you for taking the time  
8 and being very attentive to our arguments.

9 As I suspect you're probably already aware, the  
10 real argument here is the one you heard from Mr. Dunckley.  
11 It appears to have a great deal of traction, and I'm not  
12 going to repeat it. He was very articulate. One of the  
13 best oral arguments I've ever heard, and it was from a  
14 nonlawyer.

15 I would encourage the Court to really look at  
16 what he had to say. He appears to be correct. And if he  
17 is correct, it would be injustice not to allow him to  
18 withdraw that plea.

19 The other claims, it's sort of part of this  
20 petition because we have raised this as part of the habeas  
21 petition, but since Mr. Dunckley represented himself, I  
22 was instructed not to get involved in that part of it. If  
23 it goes up on appeal, it's my intention to take it because  
24 I think it is a meritorious argument.

1           The other grounds are ineffective assistance of  
2 counsel. You heard from Mr. Dunckley that he would not  
3 have entered into this plea had he had all of the  
4 information prior to entering the plea that he had after  
5 he was in prison.

6           Mr. O'Mara refuted some of that but also agreed  
7 to some of that. He hadn't provided the DNA evidence. He  
8 said he talked about it. Mr. Dunckley denied that, but he  
9 didn't have a copy of the DNA evidence.

10          Mr. Dunckley said, I think fairly accurately,  
11 that he was not a sophisticated litigant at the time that  
12 he entered the plea. He relied on his attorney. And his  
13 attorney, under the case of *Warner vs. State*, 102 Nev.  
14 635, is absolutely obligated to do an investigation as  
15 when you're involving with a lewdness with a minor under  
16 the age of 14. And that's exactly this case.

17          Now, Mr. O'Mara said that he had gone to these  
18 places and looked around. That's not in the -- this is a  
19 very serious charge, as you're aware of. You sentenced  
20 him to ten to life.

21          He should have been entitled and his attorney  
22 should have gotten a real live investigator that knew  
23 exactly what he was doing, went out and interviewed every  
24 one of the witnesses, looked at every one of the crime

1 scenes himself.

2 Mr. O'Mara is an attorney. He's not an  
3 investigator. For that reason alone, Mr. Dunckley was  
4 denied his 6th Amendment right to an effective attorney.  
5 The Supreme Court has said if you don't conduct an  
6 investigation in a lewdness with minor case, it denies  
7 your client his rights under the system to an effective  
8 attorney. That's exactly what happened in this case.

9 Mr. O'Mara was deficient in a couple of other  
10 respects. I think he used the Brianna Denison case to  
11 scare Mr. Dunckley, and apparently it worked. That's not  
12 a reason not to go to trial.

13 We in the judicial system are well aware that  
14 juries are pretty capable of separating stuff they hear  
15 outside the jury box and stuff they hear inside the jury  
16 box. Just because an attractive young woman was raped and  
17 murdered and it made headline news for a long period of  
18 time is not a reason to take a meritorious case to trial.

19 This case, one of the victims had a .226 BA.  
20 Mr. Hatlestad agreed that at least one of the victims was  
21 unreliable. This was a triable case, should have gone to  
22 trial, and Mr. Dunckley testified that he simply relied on  
23 his attorney for that advice.

24 THE COURT: But the attorney says he told

1 Mr. Dunckley not to take the plea.

2 MR. STORY: That's what the attorney says.

3 That's not what Mr. Dunckley says.

4 The attorney doesn't want an ineffective  
5 assistance of counsel wrap on him. He's got to work. Of  
6 course, Mr. Dunckley doesn't want to spend the rest of his  
7 life in prison, either. So there's potential credibility  
8 issues here. Attorneys are always much more convincing  
9 than their clients.

10 But Mr. Dunckley's position is: I wouldn't have  
11 taken the deal, one, if you had told me all of the  
12 evidence, if I had known there was DNA evidence that  
13 exonerated me or at least made it much more likely to go  
14 to trial, I'd have gone to trial.

15 He has some kids, so he took a plea because he  
16 thought he might get probation.

17 Frankly, I do think the strongest argument of the  
18 whole bunch is the argument of illusory plea bargain. If  
19 probation isn't available and you take the deal because  
20 you think you're going to get probation, you have got an  
21 illusory contract. But, as I said, Mr. Dunckley was  
22 articulate about that point.

23 THE COURT: But the attorney was very clear he  
24 argued and told Mr. Dunckley that it was a low probability



1 that he would get probation. Whether he was right or not  
2 about whether probation is available, that argument I  
3 understand. But assuming that that argument is not  
4 viable, that probation were available, the attorney,  
5 Mr. O'Mara, testified vehemently that he told his client  
6 he wouldn't get probation. Yes, it's available, but  
7 you're not going to get it. This judge, with these facts,  
8 is not going to give it to you.

9 MR. STORY: You're absolutely correct. That's  
10 exactly what he said.

11 THE COURT: So why is there an argument that your  
12 client wouldn't have pled guilty if he thought he was  
13 going to go to prison? He was told he was going to go to  
14 prison.

15 MR. STORY: Because the only way he's going to go  
16 to prison if he doesn't plead guilty is if Kellie Anne  
17 Vilorio convicts him of some of those crimes.

18 There is evidence in the file that shows that  
19 Mr. Dunckley didn't do some of those crimes, or at least  
20 can make a very straight-faced, logical, and coherent  
21 argument.

22 If the argument is if one of the victims says, He  
23 made me perform oral sex, and they take a DNA sample from  
24 Mr. Dunckley to show that there's none of her DNA there,

1 he's got a great argument at trial. He would have gone to  
2 trial had he had that information. That's his complaint  
3 about ineffective assistance.

4 Had his attorney gone out and done the  
5 investigation or actually hired an investigator, which he  
6 had the right and the responsibility I think to do --  
7 Mr. Dunckley provided him with a great deal of information  
8 that showed he wasn't even in the jurisdiction during the  
9 time frame that some of these crimes were alleged to have  
10 occurred. The investigator could have come up with  
11 additional witnesses to bring into court. He would have  
12 had an excellent defense.

13 He didn't take that deal because his attorney  
14 didn't offer him the information ahead of time. Had he  
15 had that DNA report ahead of time, that in and of itself  
16 would have been sufficient grounds or sufficient reason  
17 for Mr. Dunckley to say, no, I'm not going to take the  
18 deal; let's go to trial.

19 In fact, you heard Mr. O'Mara say we'd run up  
20 against trial one other time. They were prepared to go to  
21 trial. Mr. Dunckley was prepared to go to trial.

22 He's got four kids. He had to make a really  
23 sound decision. What am I going to do for my family? If  
24 I can get probation and I don't have any evidence to --

1 enough evidence to exonerate me, I'm going to take my  
2 chance at probation.

3 Had he known about the DNA, however, he wouldn't  
4 have taken the deal. And that's ineffective assistance of  
5 counsel.

6 An attorney has an absolute obligation to let the  
7 client decide: Do I go to trial? Do I not go to trial?  
8 And the only way he can do that intelligently is put all  
9 the cards on the table and say: All right, Brendan,  
10 here's the evidence against you.

11 THE COURT: There is a disagreement about that,  
12 though.

13 MR. STORY: That's correct.

14 THE COURT: Mr. O'Mara said he did tell him.

15 MR. STORY: That's correct; there is a  
16 disagreement.

17 So with that, we would request that the Court  
18 grant the petition for habeas corpus.

19 He's not asking to be exonerated for this. He  
20 just wants to go to trial. The evidence is there to  
21 disprove these claims. He wants to go to trial. He  
22 doesn't think he got a fair shot from his attorney. He  
23 wasn't effectively represented. For those reasons, he  
24 should have his habeas petition granted. Thank you.

1 THE COURT: Thank you.

2 Mr. Hatlestad?

3 MR. HATLESTAD: Thanks, Your Honor.

4 I agree with at least part of what Counsel said  
5 about *Warner*, but there's a prejudice prong. It's not  
6 simply a failure to investigate. We had to hear what the  
7 investigation would have in fact shown.

8 And although the test from *Hill vs. Lockhart* is  
9 the reasonable probability that the defendant would not  
10 have plead guilty, the reasonableness of the probability  
11 depends on what would have been shown had the  
12 investigation been done. That's what we're lacking here.

13 The other problem with this case, as Counsel  
14 pointed out, and I think you anticipated to some extent,  
15 is we have a credibility test here.

16 We have Mr. O'Mara who testified in this case  
17 without any contradiction. He was never impeached with  
18 any statement. He's apparently made no prior statements  
19 to anyone that are on the record.

20 But what we have on the other hand is  
21 Mr. Dunckley. And Mr. Dunckley, by his own admission, has  
22 lied numerous times in this case. He lied to police. He  
23 lied to Mr. Ing. He lied during his change of plea  
24 hearing. It appears he lied during his sentencing

1 hearing. And he made a lie when gave his statement in  
2 allocution, his handwritten statement that's part of the  
3 presentence investigation report. All of those things are  
4 untrue.

5 And then he comes in today, which I thought was a  
6 very good point, that if there's no DNA and the motion to  
7 suppress is granted, that puts a different complexion  
8 particularly on the Jessica case.

9 You pull out the transcript, and despite what  
10 Mr. Dunckley said this morning about him being told he's  
11 not free to leave, you can look at page 121 of his  
12 statement which is part of his exhibits. Right after the  
13 interview starts, he says:

14 "Broome: You know you're not under arrest;  
15 you're free to leave?

16 "I know.

17 "Anytime you want. So we talked about  
18 yesterday, and you just know. You informed  
19 everything to Morgan. She knows  
20 everything."

21 So when Mr. Dunckley comes in here today and says  
22 there's a police booking sheet in front of my face and I'm  
23 told from the get-go that I'm not free to leave, that is  
24 just a lie. That's completely repealed by his own

1 exhibit. It's right here.

2 "You know you're not under arrest. You're  
3 free to leave?

4 "I know."

5 What are we supposed to do with that? I mean, at  
6 every junction in this case that's critical, he just made  
7 a mistake and failed to tell the truth.

8 Has Mr. O'Mara been shown to have done that? No.  
9 His account is different than Mr. Dunckley's, but  
10 Mr. Dunckley's presentation seems to be a contrivance set  
11 for the context. That was his explanation of the  
12 statement to Broome. That was his explanation to the  
13 change of plea: I was told I had to say certain things.  
14 I came into the sentencing hearing and said things so I'd  
15 get the deal.

16 All of these things seem to be contrived so that  
17 he can get result that he wants. And that's exactly what  
18 we have here.

19 So without with regard to the enumerated claims  
20 of error in this case, it seems to me that there's been a  
21 failure of proof on prejudice.

22 We could say from a matter of argument we could  
23 conceive that perhaps Mr. O'Mara didn't do a sufficiently  
24 in-depth investigation, but it's not entirely clear what

1 the scope of a reasonable investigation in this case would  
2 have revealed. There's been no showing that Mr. O'Mara's  
3 investigation was incomplete, nothing showing that even if  
4 an investigator had been appointed and hired, that person  
5 would have uncovered additional information.

6 And then we have to come back to Mr. O'Mara who  
7 says: I knew about results of the DNA test, and I went  
8 over them with my client. And my client's attitude was:  
9 I want to take my chances on probation because I think I'm  
10 going to get it.

11 That's what it really boils down to.

12 My initial thought when I read the case was,  
13 okay, now, we have a credibility problem perhaps with  
14 Ashley. How would she have weathered cross-examination?  
15 Well, we don't know because she's not here. So perhaps  
16 the lawyer was ineffective or the performance was  
17 unreasonable by not going out and talking to her.

18 But we don't have the next question, which is:  
19 What would be the outcome of that investigation? That's  
20 what's lacking here. And likewise with Jessica.

21 So that sort of takes away the credibility  
22 problem with the victims because we don't know how they  
23 would testify under cross-examination.

24 So, okay, if we take out the DNA, then we have a

1 stronger case. But Mr. Dunckley, in his statement to  
2 Detective Broome, has already admitted there was oral  
3 contact. So what do we do with that? Well, we have to  
4 have an explanation for why there's no DNA evidence found  
5 in the specimen, and he provides the explanation himself.  
6 It may have been wiped off. So now that begins to  
7 evaporate.

8 Then we are left with the statement. And again,  
9 if you have got no DNA, you've got a suppressed statement,  
10 then the case for the defense looks better.

11 But as I suggested to Mr. O'Mara, there aren't  
12 grounds for motion to suppress in this case. Nothing to  
13 indicate that his statement was involuntary in any way.  
14 He's at the police station for the second time  
15 voluntarily.

16 And he's told, as I said before, from the  
17 beginning, despite what he says, the transcript, his  
18 exhibit: "You're free to leave." "I know." So we don't  
19 have custody.

20 So we have no involuntary statement. We don't  
21 have a *Miranda* problem. So we have a statement that's  
22 going to be introduced to the jury, and we're going to  
23 have the testimony of two victims who may or may not have  
24 been impeached. And assuming they could've been, we don't



1 know on what topics because we haven't heard from them.

2 So for me, I respectfully submit to the Court  
3 what's essentially a failure of proof on both prongs of  
4 the *Hill* test, and the petition should be denied.

5 THE COURT: Counsel?

6 MR. STORY: Your Honor, I think the Court has a  
7 full grasp of the problem in front of it. The only  
8 request I'd make is that you simultaneously rule on both  
9 the petition and the motion so that the appeal is clean,  
10 assuming one party or the other is likely to appeal this  
11 petition. So I would request they come out at the same  
12 time if possible.

13 THE COURT: Okay. And you are going to represent  
14 Mr. Dunckley on the appeal?

15 MR. STORY: My experience with the Supreme Court  
16 they will make me, yes.

17 THE COURT: Well, since you know that  
18 Mr. Dunckley wants to appeal if he has an adverse ruling,  
19 you're under an obligation if you have told him you're  
20 going to appeal to actually do it. I just want to make  
21 sure we don't miss any deadlines.

22 MR. STORY: I won't. My practice is to appeal  
23 the second day I get the ruling, so I'm not even close to  
24 the 30 days. I'll take care of that, Your Honor.

1           THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm going to look at the  
2 statutory construction again. You're right: Mr. Dunckley  
3 had a great argument, and so I want to read it over again,  
4 and then I'll contact Counsel about my ruling. So I'll  
5 take it under submission at this time.

6           Anything further?

7           MR. STORY: Nothing, Your Honor.

8           THE COURT: Okay. Court's in recess.

9                       (Proceedings concluded at 2:22 p.m.)

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 STATE OF NEVADA )  
 )  
2 COUNTY OF WASHOE )

3

4 I, STEPHANI L. LODER, Certified Shorthand  
5 Reporter of the Second Judicial District Court of the  
6 State of Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe, do  
7 hereby certify:

8 That I was present in Department No. 4 of the  
9 above-entitled Court and took stenotype notes of the  
10 proceedings entitled herein, and thereafter transcribed  
11 the same into typewriting as herein appears;

12 That the foregoing transcript is a full, true  
13 and correct transcription of my stenotype notes of said  
14 proceedings.

15 DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 5th day of  
16 July, 2011.

17

18 /s/ Stephani L. Loder  
STEPHANI L. LODER, CCR No. 862

19

20

21

22

23

24

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 07-13-2011:13:22:01  
**Clerk Accepted:** 07-13-2011:13:22:48  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Transcript  
**Filed By:** Stephani L. Loder

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

KELLI VILORIA, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

CASE NO. CR07-1728

**TITLE: THE STATE OF NEVADA VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY**

**DATE, JUDGE**

**OFFICERS OF**

**COURT PRESENT**

**APPEARANCES-HEARING**

**CONT'D TO**

6/3/11	<b><u>MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEA</u></b>
HONORABLE	Chief Deputy District Attorney Gary Hatlestad, Esq., represented the State.
CONNIE	Defendant present representing himself.
STEINHEIMER	Motion for Withdrawal of Guilty Plea by Defendant; presented argument;
DEPT. NO.4	objection and argument by State's counsel; reply by Defendant.
M. Stone	<b>COURT</b> took matter under advisement.
(Clerk)	
S. Loder	
(Reporter)	

---

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 07-26-2011:14:16:02  
**Clerk Accepted:** 07-26-2011:14:16:42  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** \*\*\*Minutes  
**Filed By:** Marci Trabert

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA  
BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

CASE NO. CR07-1728 **TITLE: THE STATE OF NEVADA VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY**

<b>DATE, JUDGE</b>	<b>APPEARANCES-HEARING</b>	<b>CONT'D TO</b>
<b>OFFICERS OF</b>		
<b>COURT PRESENT</b>		

8/12/11	<b><u>CONFERENCE CALL – TELEPHONIC DECISION</u></b>	
HONORABLE	Chief Deputy District Attorney Gary Hatlestad, Esq., was present	
CONNIE	telephonically representing the State. Defendant Brendan Dunckley was	
STEINHEIMER	present telephonically representing himself.	
DEPT. NO.4	<b>COURT ENTERED ORDER</b> denying the Defendant's Motion to Withdraw	
R. Woosley	Guilty Plea, based upon the defendant knowingly entering his plea at the	
(Clerk)	time of the hearing.	
Not Reported		
(Reporter)		

---

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 08-18-2011:08:22:50  
**Clerk Accepted:** 08-18-2011:08:23:31  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** \*\*\*Minutes  
**Filed By:** Rhianna Cotter

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

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

\* \* \*

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. CR07-1728

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

Dept. No. 4

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEAS

This matter came before the Court on Dunckley's Motion to Withdraw Guilty Pleas. In his Motion, Dunckley alleged that his pleas are invalid because he was not advised that probation was not available for the crime of lewdness with a child under fourteen years, and attempted sexual assault, and the Court compounded the error by advising him that probation was available.

Since Dunckley committed the crime of lewdness with a child under the age of fourteen years, as alleged in Count I, between August 1998 and August 2000, the law in effect at that time controls. During that time frame probation was available for the offense of lewdness with a child under the age of fourteen years. See 1997 Statutes of Nevada, pp. 2504-5; see also 1997 Statutes of Nevada, pp. 1187, 2509; see also 1999 Statutes of Nevada, pp. 565, 1192. As a result, the Court finds and concludes that probation was available and correctly advised Dunckley

1 accordingly when advising him of the consequences of his pleas.

2 Furthermore, probation was also available for the crime of attempted sexual assault, as  
3 alleged in Count II, which occurred in 2008. As above, the law in effect when the crime was  
4 committed controls. During that time frame probation was available for the offense of  
5 attempted sexual assault. See NRS 176A.100(1); NRS 176A.110(1), (3)(a). As a result, the Court  
6 finds and concludes that probation was available and correctly advised Dunckley accordingly  
7 when advising him of the consequences of his pleas.

8 Finally, the Court notes that Dunckley, at various locations in his moving papers, also  
9 alludes to the ineffective assistance provided by his trial lawyer, David O'Mara, who, it is  
10 alleged, misinformed him about the availability of probation. As noted above, probation was  
11 available in this case, on both counts. It necessarily follows that Mr. O'Mara, by informing  
12 Dunckley of the availability of probation, did not provide ineffective assistance.<sup>1</sup>

13 It is therefor the judgment and order of the Court that Dunckley's Motion to Withdraw  
14 his Guilty Pleas is denied.

15 DATED this 23 day of December, 2011.

16  
17 Connie J. Steinheimer  
18 DISTRICT JUDGE

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 <sup>1</sup>The Court also notes that Dunckley filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-  
26 Conviction), which was litigated at the same time as his motion. The former will be addressed  
in a separate order. Accord, NRS 34.830.

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 12-29-2011:10:56:08  
**Clerk Accepted:** 12-29-2011:10:57:11  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Ord Denying Motion  
**Filed By:** Audrey Kay

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY

GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

1 Code: 2515  
2 ROBERT W. STORY, ESQ., Bar No. 1268  
3 STORY LAW GROUP  
4 245 East Liberty Street, Suite 530  
5 Reno, Nevada 89501  
6 Telephone: (775) 284-5510  
7 Facsimile: (775) 284-0800

8 Attorneys for Petitioner Plaintiff Brendan Dunckley

9  
10  
11 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA  
12  
13 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE  
14

15 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

16 Petitioner,

Case No. CR07-1728

17 vs.

Dept. No. 4

18 STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,

19 Respondents.

20 **NOTICE OF APPEAL**

21 Petitioner Brendan Dunckley hereby appeals to the Nevada Supreme Court the Order  
22 Denying Motion to Withdraw Guilty Pleas entered on December 29, 2011, and attached as Exhibit 1.

23 **AFFIRMATION**

24 **Pursuant to NRS 239B.030**

25 The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social  
26 security number of any person.

27 December 30, 2011.

28 STORY LAW GROUP

By: /s/ Robert W. Story  
ROBERT W. STORY

Attorneys for Petitioner Brendan Dunckley

**EXHIBIT INDEX**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Exhibit 1  
Exhibit 2

Declaration of Robert W. Story, Esq.  
Order Denying Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea

1 page  
2 pages

**EXHIBIT 1**

**EXHIBIT 1**

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

I, Robert W. Story, declare as follows:

I am a member of Story Law Group with business offices located at 245 E. Liberty Street, Suite 530, Reno, Nevada 89501. I am over the age of 21 and not a party to this action.

On December 30, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing **Notice of Appeal** with the Clerk of the Second Judicial District Court via the Court's e-Flex system.

I certify that all participants in the case are registered e-Flex users and that service will be accomplished by e-Flex.

Gary Hatelstad  
Chief Deputy District Attorney  
Washoe County, Nevada

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on December 30, 2011.

STORY LAW GROUP

By: /s/ Robert W. Story  
ROBERT W. STORY

**EXHIBIT 2**

**EXHIBIT 2**



**FILED**  
Electronically  
12-29-2011:10:56:08 AM  
Craig Franden  
Clerk of the Court  
Transaction # 2672273

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

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

\* \* \*

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. CR07-1728

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

Dept. No. 4

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO WITHDRAW GUILTY PLEAS

This matter came before the Court on Dunckley's Motion to Withdraw Guilty Pleas. In his Motion, Dunckley alleged that his pleas are invalid because he was not advised that probation was not available for the crime of lewdness with a child under fourteen years, and attempted sexual assault, and the Court compounded the error by advising him that probation was available.

Since Dunckley committed the crime of lewdness with a child under the age of fourteen years, as alleged in Count I, between August 1998 and August 2000, the law in effect at that time controls. During that time frame probation was available for the offense of lewdness with a child under the age of fourteen years. See 1997 Statutes of Nevada, pp. 2504-5; see also 1997 Statutes of Nevada, pp. 1187, 2509; see also 1999 Statutes of Nevada, pp. 565, 1192. As a result, the Court finds and concludes that probation was available and correctly advised Dunckley

1 accordingly when advising him of the consequences of his pleas.

2 Furthermore, probation was also available for the crime of attempted sexual assault, as  
3 alleged in Count II, which occurred in 2008. As above, the law in effect when the crime was  
4 committed controls. During that time frame probation was available for the offense of  
5 attempted sexual assault. See NRS 176A.100(1); NRS 176A.110(1), (3)(a). As a result, the Court  
6 finds and concludes that probation was available and correctly advised Dunckley accordingly  
7 when advising him of the consequences of his pleas.

8 Finally, the Court notes that Dunckley, at various locations in his moving papers, also  
9 alludes to the ineffective assistance provided by his trial lawyer, David O'Mara, who, it is  
10 alleged, misinformed him about the availability of probation. As noted above, probation was  
11 available in this case, on both counts. It necessarily follows that Mr. O'Mara, by informing  
12 Dunckley of the availability of probation, did not provide ineffective assistance.<sup>1</sup>

13 It is therefor the judgment and order of the Court that Dunckley's Motion to Withdraw  
14 his Guilty Pleas is denied.

15 DATED this 23 day of December, 2011.

16  
17 Connie J. Steinheimer  
18 DISTRICT JUDGE

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 <sup>1</sup>The Court also notes that Dunckley filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-  
26 Conviction), which was litigated at the same time as his motion. The former will be addressed  
in a separate order. Accord, NRS 34.830.

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\*  
PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 12-30-2011:09:41:39  
**Clerk Accepted:** 12-30-2011:10:33:02  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Notice/Appeal Supreme Court  
- \*\*Continuation  
- \*\*Continuation  
**Filed By:** ROBERT STORY, ESQ.

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA  
BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

1 Code: 1310  
2 ROBERT W. STORY, ESQ., Bar No. 1268  
3 STORY LAW GROUP  
4 245 East Liberty Street, Suite 530  
5 Reno, Nevada 89501  
6 Telephone: (775) 284-5510  
7 Facsimile: (775) 284-0800

8 Attorneys for Petitioner Plaintiff Brendan Dunckley

9  
10  
11 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA  
12  
13 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE  
14  
15

16 BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

17 Petitioner,

Case No. CR07-1728

18 vs.

Dept. No. 4

19 STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,

20 Respondents.

21 **CASE APPEAL STATEMENT**

22 Pursuant to NRAP 3(f)(3), Appellant Brendan Dunckley hereby files this Case Appeal  
23 Statement.

- 24 1. Appellant Brendan Dunckley.
- 25 2. Honorable Connie J. Steinheimer, District Judge.
- 26 3. Counsel for Appellant Brendan Dunckley:
- 27 Robert W. Story  
Story Law Group  
245 E. Liberty Street, Suite 530  
Reno, Nevada 89501
- 28 4. Counsel for Respondent State of Nevada:

Gary H. Hatlestad  
Chief Appellate Deputy  
Post Office Box 30083  
Reno, Nevada 89502-3083

1 5. All counsel are licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada.

2 6. Appellant Brendan Dunckley was represented by appointed counsel in the district  
3 court and is represented by appointed counsel in the appeal.

4 7. Appellant Brendan Dunckley was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis on  
5 October 28, 2009.

6 8. On April 5, 2007, the State of Nevada filed a Criminal Complaint against Appellant  
7 Brendan Dunckley.

8 9. The appeal is from an Order Denying Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea entered on  
9 December 29, 2011.

10 10. This case was previously the subject of a direct appeal: *Brendan Dunckley, Appellant,*  
11 *v. The State of Nevada, Respondent;* Nevada Supreme Court Case Number 52383; Order of  
12 Affirmance entered on May 8, 2009.

13 11. This case does not involve child custody or visitation.

14 12. This case does not involve the possibility of settlement.

15 13. This is not a fast track appeal.

16 **AFFIRMATION**

17 **Pursuant to NRS 239B.030**

18 The undersigned do hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social  
19 security number of any person.

20 December 30, 2011.

21 STORY LAW GROUP

22  
23 By: /s/ Robert W. Story  
24 ROBERT W. STORY

25 Attorneys for Petitioner Brendan Dunckley  
26  
27  
28

**EXHIBIT INDEX**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Exhibit 1

Declaration of Robert W. Story, Esq.

1 page

**EXHIBIT 1**

**EXHIBIT 1**

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Robert W. Story, declare as follows:

I am a member of Story Law Group with business offices located at 245 E. Liberty Street, Suite 530, Reno, Nevada 89501. I am over the age of 21 and not a party to this action.

On December 30, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing **Case Appeal Statement** with the Clerk of the Second Judicial District Court via the Court's e-Flex system.

I certify that all participants in the case are registered e-Flex users and that service will be accomplished by e-Flex.

Gary Hatelstad  
Chief Deputy District Attorney  
Washoe County, Nevada

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on December 30, 2011.

STORY LAW GROUP

By: /s/ Robert W. Story  
ROBERT W. STORY

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 12-30-2011:11:05:32  
**Clerk Accepted:** 12-30-2011:11:27:54  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Case Appeal Statement  
- \*\*Continuation  
**Filed By:** ROBERT STORY, ESQ.

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA  
BRENDAN DUNCKLEY

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Code 1350**

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

**BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,**

**Petitioner,**

**vs.**

**Case No. CR07-01728**

**Dept. No. 4**

**THE STATE OF NEVADA, et al,**

**RESPONDENTS.**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL – NOTICE OF APPEAL**

I certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, County of Washoe; that on the 30th day of December, 2011, I electronically filed the Notice of Appeal in the above entitled matter to the Nevada Supreme Court.

I further certify that the transmitted record is a true and correct copy of the original pleadings on file with the Second Judicial District Court.

Dated this 30th day of December, 2011.

CRAIG FRANDEN  
ACTING CLERK OF THE COURT

By /s/Mary Fernandez  
Mary Fernandez  
Deputy Clerk

**\*\*\*\*\* IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION \*\*\*\*\***  
**PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

-

**A filing has been submitted to the court RE:** CR07-1728  
**Judge:** CONNIE STEINHEIMER  
**Official File Stamp:** 12-30-2011:14:23:05  
**Clerk Accepted:** 12-30-2011:14:23:47  
**Court:** Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada  
**Case Title:** STATE VS. BRENDAN DUNCKLEY (D4)  
**Document(s) Submitted:** Certificate of Clerk  
**Filed By:** Mary Fernandez

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.

This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

-

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.

**The following people were served electronically:**

ROBERT STORY, ESQ. for BRENDAN  
DUNCKLEY  
GARY HATLESTAD, ESQ. for STATE OF  
NEVADA

**The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada electronic filing rules):**

STATE OF NEVADA  
BRENDAN DUNCKLEY