

No. C193182

Dept. No. 18 **FILED**

JAN 23 2 57 PM '08

IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE
STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR
THE COUNTY OF CLARK

Cliff
CLERK OF THE COURT

No. 50972

FILED

JAN 28 2008

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *Tracie K. Lindeman*
DEPUTY CLERK

GLENFORD BUDD

Petitioner/Plaintiff,

v.

THE STATE OF NEVADA

Respondent/Defendant.

NOTICE OF APPEAL


Notice is hereby given that GLENFORD BUDD, Petitioner/Defendant above named,
hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of Nevada from the final judgment/order

(FINDINGS OF FACT; CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER)

entered in this action on the 8th day of January, 2008.

Dated this 21 day of January, 2008.

Glenford A. Budd
Appellant
Ely State Prison
P.O. Box 1989
Ely, Nevada 89301-1989



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, GLENFORD BUDD, hereby certify pursuant to N.R.C.P. 5(b), that on this day of the month of January, of the year 2008, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL

_____ addressed to:

CLERK OF THE COURT

Name

200 Lewis Ave., 3rd Fl.
Las Vegas, NV 89155-1160

Address

DAVID ROGER


Name

District Attorney
200 Lewis Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212

Address

Name

Address


Signature

GLENFORD BUDD #90043
Ely State Prison
P.O. Box 1989
Ely, Nevada 89301

AFFIRMATION
Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding NOTICE OF APPEAL

(Title of Document)

filed in District Court Case No. C193182

☒ Does not contain the social security number of any person.

-OR-

☐ Contains the social security number of a person as required by:

A. A specific state or federal law, to wit:

(State specific law)

-OR-

B. For the administration of a public program or
for an application for a federal or state grant.

James D. Budd
(Signature)

1/21/08
(Date)

1 ASTA

FILED

2008 JAN 25 A 9:13

4 DISTRICT COURT
5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA


CLERK OF THE COURT

7 STATE OF NEVADA,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 vs.

10 GLENFORD BUDD,

11 Defendant(s),

)
) Case No: C193182
) Dept No: XVIII
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

14 CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

15 1. Appellant(s): GLENFORD BUDD

16 2. Judge: DAVID BARKER

17 3. All Parties, District Court:

18 Plaintiff, THE STATE OF NEVADA

19 Defendant(s), GLENFORD BUDD

20 4. All Parties, Appeal:

21 Appellant(s), GLENFORD BUDD

22 Respondent, THE STATE OF NEVADA

23 5. Appellate Counsel:

24 *Appellant/Proper Person*
25 Glenford Budd # 90043
26 P.O. Box 1989
27 Ely, NV 89301

Respondent
David Roger, District Attorney
200 Lewis Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 671-2700

1 6. District Court Attorney, Appointed

2 7. On Appeal, N/A


3 8. Forma Pauperis, Granted

4 9. Date Commenced in District Court: June 26, 2003

5 Dated This 25 day of January 2008.

6 Charles J. Short, Clerk of the Court

7
8 By:



9 Heather Lofquist, Deputy Clerk
10 200 Lewis Ave
11 PO Box 551601
12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-1601
13 (702) 671-0512
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATE: 01/25/08
CASE NO. 03-C-193182-C

I N D E X

TIME 9:03 AM
JUDGE:Barker, David

STATE OF NEVADA

[] vs Budd, Glenford A

[]

0001 D1 Glenford A Budd
P O Box 1989
Ely Nevada, NV 89301

Pro Se

NO.	FILED/REC	CODE	REASON/DESCRIPTION	FOR	OC	SCH/PER	C
0001	06/26/03	CBO	/CRIMINAL BINDOVER Fee \$0.00				
0002	06/26/03	ARRN	/INITIAL ARRAIGNMENT	0001		07/02/03	
0003	06/26/03	INFO	/INFORMATION	0001		06/26/03	
0004	06/27/03	NOEV	/NOTICE OF EXHIBITS IN THE VAULT			06/26/03	
0005	06/26/03	CBOR	/CRIMINAL BINDOVER RECEIPT	0001			
0006	07/02/03	CALC	/CALENDAR CALL (VJ 2/11/04)	0001	VC	02/18/04	
0007	07/02/03	JURY	/TRIAL BY JURY (VJ 2/11/04)	0001	VC	02/23/04	
0008	07/03/03	ORDR	/MEDIA REQUEST TO PERMIT CAMERA ACCESS TO PROCEEDINGS AND ORDER GRANTING	0001		07/03/03	
0009	07/07/03	TRAN	/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT PRELIMINARY HEARING	0001		06/16/03	
0010	07/25/03	NISD	/NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK DEATH PENALTY	0001			
0011	07/28/03	CRTF	/CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION	0001		07/28/03	
0012	08/08/03	TRAN	/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT PRELIMINARY HEARING VOLUME II	0001		06/25/03	
0013	10/27/03	TRAN	/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT RE: ARRAIGNMENT	0001		07/02/03	
0014	01/27/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN TO VACATE /CONTINUE TRIAL DATE/4	0001	GR	02/11/04	
0015	01/28/04	RAO	/MEDIA REQUEST AND ORDER	0001	GR	01/28/04	
0016	02/12/04	CALC	/CALENDAR CALL (vj 5/24/04)	0001	VC	07/14/04	
0017	02/12/04	JURY	/TRIAL BY JURY (vj 5/24/04)	0001	VC	07/19/04	
0018	05/12/04	HEAR	/STATE'S REQUEST RESET TRIAL DATE	0001		05/24/04	
0019	05/24/04	CALC	/CALENDAR CALL	0001		11/10/04	
0020	05/24/04	JURY	/TRIAL BY JURY (VJ 11/10/04)	0001	VC	11/15/04	
0022	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 1/11	0001	GR	11/23/05	
0023	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 2/12	0001	GR	11/23/05	
0024	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 3/13	0001	GR	11/23/05	
0025	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 4/14	0001	MT	11/23/05	
0026	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 6/15	0001	MT	11/23/05	
0027	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 7/16	0001	DN	11/23/05	
0028	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 8/17	0001	DN	11/23/05	
0029	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 5/18	0001	MT	11/23/05	
0030	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 9/19	0001	GR	11/23/05	
0031	09/14/04	MOT	/DEFT'S MTN 10/20	0001	GR	11/23/05	
0032	09/15/04	NOTC	/CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDERS NOTICE OF QUALIFICATIONS PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 250(2)(g) AND (h)	0001			Y
0033	09/21/04	OPPS	/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION IN LIMINE FOR ORDER PROIBITING PROSECUTION MISCONDUCT IN ARGUMENT AND FOR ORDER THAT COURT TAKES JUDICIAL NOTICE OF AUTHORITY CITED IN THIS MOTION IN DEFENSE OBJECTS AT TRIAL TO IMPROPER ARGUMENT	0001			Y
0034	09/21/04	OPPS	/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION TO ALLOW THE DEFENSE TO ARGUE LAST IN A POTENTIAL PENALTY PHASE PROCEEDING	0001			Y
0035	09/21/04	OPPS	/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR RECORDING OF ALL PROCEEDINGS	0001			Y

(Continued to page 2)

NO.	FILED/REC CODE	REASON/DESCRIPTION	FOR	OC	SCH/PER	C
PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 250						
0036	09/21/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			Y
		TO DISQUALIFY ALL POTENTIAL JURORS WHO	0001			
KNEW OR WERE ACQUAINTED WITH THE VICTIMS OR THEIR FAMILIES						
0037	09/21/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			Y
		IN LIMINE TO PROHIBIT ANY REFERENCE IN	0001			
FRONT OF THE JURY TO THE TRIAL PHASE OF THE PROCEEDINGS AS THE GUILT PHASE						
0038	09/21/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			Y
		TO DISQUALIFY ALL POTENTIAL JURORS WHO	0001			
WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IN THE EVENT OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER CONVICTION						
0039	09/21/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			
		TO BIFURCATE PENALTY PHASE	0001			
0040	09/22/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			Y
		FOR JURY QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE	0001			
COMPLETED BY JURE VENIRE ONE WEEK PRIOR TO TRIAL						
0041	09/28/04	LIST/NOTICE OF EXPERT WITNESSES	0001			
0042	09/28/04	LIST/NOTICE OF WITNESSES	0001			
0043	10/04/04	MOT /DEFT'S MTN #12 TO PRECLUDE THE ADMISSION	0001	DN	11/23/05	
		DURING POSSIBLE PENALTY PROCEEDING/21	0001			
0044	10/04/04	MOT /DEFT'S MTN #14 TO DISMISS STATE NTC OF	0001	DN	11/23/05	
		INTENT BECAUSE NV DEATH/22	0001			
0045	10/04/04	MOT /DEFT'S MTN #13 TO BAR ADMISSION OF	0001	GR	11/23/05	
		CUMULATIVE VICTIM IMPACT EVID IN/23	0001			
0046	10/04/04	MOT /DEFT'S MTN #11 TO STRIKE ALLEGATIONS OF	0001	DN	11/23/05	
		CERTAIN AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES/24	0001			
0047	10/06/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			Y
		IN LIMINE TO PROHIBIT THE STATE FROM	0001			
USING PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES TO REMOVE MINORITIES FROM THE JURY						
0048	10/08/04	NISD/AMENDED NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK DEATH	0001			
		PENALTY	0001			
0049	10/08/04	NOTC/NOTICE OF EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF	0001			
		AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES	0001			
0050	10/12/04	RSPN/STATES RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT BUDDS	0001			Y
		MOTION TO STRIKE ALLEGATIONS OF	0001			
CERTAIN AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES ALLEGED IN STATES NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK DEATH PENALTY						
0051	10/12/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			Y
		TO PRECLUDE THE INTRODUCTION OF VICTIM	0001			
IMPACT EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO VICTIM AND FAMILY MEMBERS CHARACTERIZATIONS						
0052	10/12/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			Y
		TO BAR THE ADMISSION OF CUMULATIVE	0001			
VICTIM IMPACT EVIDENCE IN VIOLATION OF THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE						
0053	10/14/04	OPPS/STATES OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS MOTION	0001			Y
		TO DISMISS THE STATES NOTICE OF INTENT	0001			
BECAUSE NEVADAS DEATH PENALTY SCHEME VIOLATES DUE PROCESS GUARANTEES BY FILING TO REQUIRE A PRE TRIAL FINDING OF PROBABLE CAUSE FOR ALLEGED AGGRAVATORS						
0054	10/27/04	MOT /ALL PENDING MOTIONS 10-27-04	0001		10/27/04	
0055	10/27/04	OCAL/STATUS CHECK: RESET MOTIONS	0001		11/10/04	
0056	11/10/04	MOT /ALL PENDING MOTIONS 11-10-04	0001		11/10/04	
0057	11/10/04	CALC/CALENDAR CALL (VJ 4/20/05)	0001	VC	04/27/05	
0058	11/10/04	JURY/TRIAL BY JURY (VJ 4/20/05)	0001	VC	05/02/05	

(Continued to page 3)

03-C-193182-C		(Continuation	Page	3)
NO.	FILED/REC CODE	REASON/DESCRIPTION	FOR	OC SCH/PER C
0059	01/13/05	MOT /ALL PENDING MOTIONS 1-12-05	0001	01/12/05
0060	04/20/05	MOT /ALL PENDING MOTIONS 4-20-05	0001	04/20/05
0061	04/20/05	CALC/CALENDAR CALL (FIRM)	0001	11/23/05
0062	04/20/05	JURY/TRIAL BY JURY (FIRM) (VJ 11/02/05)	0001	VC 11/28/05
0064	09/28/05	RAO /MEDIA REQUEST AND ORDER FOR CAMERA ACCESS TO COURT PROCEEDINGS	0001	09/28/05
0065	11/02/05	JURY/TRIAL BY JURY	0001	12/16/05
0066	11/02/05	OCAL/STATUS CHECK	0001	MH 11/14/05
0067	11/03/05	MOT /ALL PENDING MOTIONS 11-02-05	0001	11/02/05
0068	11/18/05	NOTC/AMENDED NOTICE OF EVIDENCE IN AGGRAVATION	0001	
0069	11/21/05	LIST/DEFENDANTS NOTICE OF EXPERT WITNESSES	0001	
0070	11/23/05	MOT /ALL PENDING MOTIONS 11-23-05	0001	11/23/05
0071	11/28/05	ORDR/ORDER FOR PRODUCTION OF INMATE	0001	SH 12/05/05
0072	12/01/05	LIST/DEFENDANTS AMENDED NOTICE OF EXPERT WITNESSES	0001	
0073	12/02/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT DEFENDANTS PRETRIAL MOTIONS	0001	11/23/05
0074	12/05/05	TRB /TRIAL BEGINS	0001	
0075	12/06/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 1	0001	12/05/05
0076	12/08/05	JURY/JURY	0001	
0077	12/08/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL VOLUME 2	0001	12/06/05
0078	12/09/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL VOLUME 3-A	0001	12/08/05
0079	12/08/05	FUS /FILED UNDER SEAL DEFENDANTS SUMMARY	0001	
0080	12/09/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 3B PM SESSION	0001	12/08/05
0081	12/12/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 4	0001	12/09/05
0082	12/12/05	STIP/STIPULATION	0001	
0083	12/15/05	OCAL/STATUS CHECK (WITNESS)	0001	OC 03/06/06
0084	12/13/05	VER /VERDICT	0001	12/13/05
0085	12/13/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 5	0001	12/12/05
0086	12/13/05	INST/INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY	0001	
0087	12/15/05	ORDR/ORDER RE: CUSTODY OF MATERIAL WITNESS GREG LEWIS ID/ #1693087	0001	12/15/05
0088	12/15/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 6	0001	12/13/05
0089	12/15/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 7	0001	12/14/05
0090	12/16/05	SENT/SENTENCING	0001	GR 02/22/06
0091	12/16/05	JMNT/SPECIAL VERDICT COUNTS 1, 2 AND 3	0001	12/20/05
0092	12/16/05	JMNT/SPECIAL VERDICT COUNTS 1, 2 AND 3	0001	12/20/05
0093	12/16/05	JMNT/PENALTY VERDICT COUNT 3	0001	12/20/05
0094	12/16/05	JMNT/PENALTY VERDICT COUNT 1	0001	12/20/05
0095	12/16/05	JMNT/PENALTY VERDICT COUNT 2	0001	12/20/05
0096	12/16/05	INST/INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY	0001	
0097	12/19/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT RE VERDICT	0001	12/16/05
0098	12/19/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONICE HEARING RE: POST TRIAL JURY QUESTIONS	0001	12/16/05

(Continued to page 4)

03-C-193182-C		(Continuation	Page	4)
NO.	FILED/REC CODE	REASON/DESCRIPTION	FOR	OC SCH/PER C
0099	12/20/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT PENALTY PHASE	0001	12/15/05
0100	12/23/05	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL	0001	12/15/05
0101	01/31/06	RAO /MEDIA REQUEST AND ORDER	0001	GR 01/31/06
0102	01/31/06	RAO /MEDIA REQUEST AND ORDER	0001	GR 01/31/06
0103	03/01/06	JMNT/JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION/ADMIN ASSESSMENT	0001	03/02/06
0104	03/01/06	JMNT/JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION/GENETIC TESTING	0001	03/02/06
0105	03/01/06	JMNT/JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION/RESTITUTION	0001	03/02/06
0106	03/07/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 5	0001 0001	12/12/05
0107	03/07/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 8-B	0001 0001	12/15/05
0108	03/07/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL VOLUME 4	0001 0001	12/09/05
0109	03/20/06	ORDR/ORDER FOR TRANSCRIPT	0001	03/20/06
0110	03/23/06	STAT/CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	0001	
0111	03/23/06	NOAS/NOTICE OF APPEAL	0001	AP 03/23/06
0112	04/11/06	ORDR/ORDER RE: CUSTODY OF MATERIAL WITNESS GREG LEWIS ID#1693087	0001 0001	04/11/06
0113	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT CALENDAR CALL STATUS CHECK RESET MOTIONS	0001 0001	11/10/04
0114	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT STATUS CHECK	0001	11/14/05
0115	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT RE MOTIONS #1 TO #14	0001 0001	04/20/05
0116	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT STATES REQUEST TO RESET TRIAL DATE	0001 0001	05/24/04
0117	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT STATUS CHECK (WITNESS)	0001 0001	
0118	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT RE MOTIONS #1 TO #14	0001 0001	01/12/05
0119	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT DEFTS MOTION TO VACATE AND CONTINUE TRIAL DATE	0001 0001	02/11/04
0120	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT STATUS CHECK	0001	01/30/06
0121	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT RE MOTIONS #1 TO #14	0001 0001	10/27/04
0122	04/20/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT SENTENCING	0001	02/22/06
0123	05/11/06	TRAN/REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT ALL PENDING MOTIONS	0001 0001	11/03/05
0124	01/12/07	APCL/APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT: CLOSED 46977		AP 01/09/07
0125	02/08/07	JMNT/CLERK'S CERTIFICATE JUDGMENT AFFIRMED	0001	02/09/07
0126	05/01/07	AFFD/AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS	0001 0001	
0127	05/01/07	CASO/CASE (RE)OPENED		05/01/07
0128	05/01/07	MOT /DEFT'S PRO PER TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS /41	0001 0001	GR 05/21/07
0129	05/01/07	MOT /DEFT'S PRO PER MTN TO WITHDRAW ATTORNEY, REQUEST FOR RECORDS & DOCUMENTS/42	0001 0001	GR 05/21/07
0130	05/21/07	MOT /ALL PENDING MOTIONS (5/21/07)	0001	05/21/07
0131	05/21/07	CCPD/CASE CLOSED PER DEPARTMENT	AL	05/21/07
0132	07/06/07	CASO/CASE (RE)OPENED		07/06/07
0133	07/05/07	MOT /DEFT'S PRO PER MTN TO HOLD HOWARD S BROOKS ATTORNEY OF RECORD IN CONTEMPT/44	0001 0001	DN 07/23/07
0134	07/06/07	ASSG/REASSIGNMENT OF JUDGE Saitta TO JUDGE Barker		

(Continued to page 5)

NO.	FILED/REC CODE	REASON/DESCRIPTION	FOR	OC	SCH/PER	C
0135	07/12/07	RSPN/CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDERS RESPONSE TO GLENFORD BUDDS MOTION TO HOLD CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER IN CONTEMPT	0001 0001			Y
0136	07/23/07	CCPD/CASE CLOSED PER DEPARTMENT	AL		07/23/07	
0137	08/10/07	NOAS/NOTICE OF APPEAL (SC 50008)	0001	AP	08/10/07	
0138	08/10/07	MOT /DEFT'S PRO PER MTN FOR REHEARING /45	0001	MH	08/27/07	
0139	08/13/07	STAT/CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	0001		08/13/07	
0140	09/11/07	APCL/APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT: CLOSED 50008			09/07/07	
0141	09/21/07	CRTF/FINANCIAL CERTIFICATE	0001			
0142	09/21/07	REQT/REQUEST FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING	0001			
0143	09/21/07	EXH /PETITIONERS EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS	0001 0001			Y
POST CONVICTION						
0144	09/21/07	PET /PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS POST CONVICTION	0001 0001			
0145	09/21/07	PTAT/MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF	0001 0001			Y
HABEAS CORPUS POST CONVICTION						
0146	09/21/07	REQT/MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS	0001 0001			
0147	09/27/07	PET /PTN FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS /46	0001	DN	11/30/07	
0148	09/27/07	CASO/CASE (RE)OPENED			09/27/07	
0149	09/27/07	PPOW/ORDER FOR PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS	0001 0001	SH	11/28/07	
0150	10/05/07	JMNT/CLERK'S CERTIFICATE APPEAL DISMISSED	0001		10/08/07	
0151	11/27/07	RSPN/STATES RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS POST	0001 0001			Y
CONVICTION						
0152	11/30/07	CCPD/CASE CLOSED PER DEPARTMENT	0001		11/30/07	
0153	01/07/08	JUDG/FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER	0001 0001	HG	11/28/07	
0154	01/08/08	NOED/NOTICE OF ENTRY OF DECISION AND ORDER	0001		01/07/08	

ORIGINAL

FILED

JAN 7 1 21 PM '08

CLERK OF THE COURT

ORDER

DAVID ROGER
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar #002781
H. LEON SIMON
Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar #000411
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212
(702) 671-2500
Attorney for Plaintiff

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

GLENFORD BUDD,
#1900089

Defendant.

CASE NO: C193182

DEPT NO: XVIII

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW AND ORDER

DATE OF HEARING: November 28, 2007
TIME OF HEARING: 8:15 A.M.

THIS CAUSE having come on for hearing before the Honorable DAVID BARKER, District Judge, on the ^{30th} day of November, 2007, the Petitioner not being present, Proceeding in Forma Pauperis, the Respondent being represented by DAVID ROGER, District Attorney, by and through DAVID STANTON, Deputy District Attorney, and the Court having considered the matter, including briefs, transcripts, ~~arguments of counsel~~, and documents on file herein, now therefore, the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On May 29, 2003, Glenford Budd (hereinafter "Defendant") was charged with three (3) counts of Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon. After a preliminary hearing, a magistrate ordered Defendant to answer the charges in District Court.

RECEIVED

JAN 7 2008

CLERK OF THE COURT

1 2. The State filed an Information on June 26, 2003. At the initial arraignment on July 2,
2 2003, Defendant pled not guilty to the charges.

3 3. The matter was set for trial which commenced on December 5, 2005. After the trial,
4 the jury returned three (3) guilty verdicts of First Degree Murder with Use of a Deadly
5 Weapon on December 13, 2005.

6 4. On December 16, 2005, Defendant was sentenced to three life sentences without
7 possibility of parole, each with an equal and consecutive sentence for use of a deadly
8 weapon. Judgment of Conviction was filed on March 1, 2006.

9 5. On March 23, 2006, Defendant filed a Notice of Appeal. On January 9, 2007, the
10 Nevada Supreme Court filed an Order of Affirmance thereby affirming Defendant's
11 conviction.

12 6. On July 5, 2007, Defendant filed a pro per motion to have his trial attorney held in
13 contempt. On July 23, 2007, Defendant's motion was denied. On August 10, 2007,
14 Defendant filed another Notice of Appeal regarding the denial to hold his attorney in
15 contempt. On September 11, 2007, the matter was closed by the Supreme Court.

16 7. On September 21, 2007, Defendant filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus (post-
17 conviction). The State responded on November 27, 2007.

18 8. Defendant received effective assistance of counsel.

19 a. Counsel was not ineffective for failing to object to a witness's testimony
20 regarding the fact that Defendant was angry about losing some marijuana
21 because such an objection would have been futile.

22 b. Counsel was not ineffective for failing to object to an eyewitness's testimony
23 because this was a strategic decision.

24 c. Counsel was not ineffective for failing to call certain witness because counsel
25 alone is entrusted with decisions regarding legal tactics.

26 d. Counsel was effective when he raised an objection to the admission of the
27 transcribed testimony of Winston Budd.

28 e. Counsel was not ineffective for posing a hypothetical stating that the State has

1 only managed to prove second-degree murder. Regardless of whether or not
2 this is considered an admission of guilt, such a concession may be a reasonable
3 trial tactic.

4 f. Counsel was not ineffective for not calling a handwriting expert to examine a
5 letter that was alleged to have been written by the victim because this was a
6 strategic decision.

7 g. Counsel was not ineffective for not objecting to jury instructions seven (7) and
8 nineteen (19) because such objections would be futile.

9 9. The District Court properly ruled on Defendant's allegation of a conflict with his
10 counsel because Defendant's claim that his counsel failed to inform the District Court of a
11 conflict of interest is entirely contradictory to the record.

12 10. This Court properly admitted the transcribed testimony of Winston Budd because the
13 witness was determined to be unavailable per NRS 51.055.

14 11. Defendant incorrectly asserts that the State did not disclose an agreement it had with
15 one of its witnesses.

16 12. There was no prosecutorial misconduct.

17 13. This Court was not required *sua sponte* to order a mistrial because there was no cause
18 in this case to do so. The State did not say anything that was inherently prejudicial. The
19 prosecutor simply informed the jurors of the information that would be presented at trial. In
20 referring to the testimony of unavailable witnesses, the prosecutor fully expected the
21 previous testimony to be entered into evidence as this Court had already ruled on the matter
22 in favor of the State.

23 14. The jury instructions in this case were proper.

24 15. Defendant received effective assistance of appellate counsel.

25 a. Defendant's appellate counsel was not ineffective for failing to federalize
26 issues in Defendant's case.

27 b. Defendant's appellate counsel need not raise futile objections or file frivolous
28 motions where there is not a legal basis to do so.

1 16. There was no cumulative error in this case.
2

3 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

4 1. In order to assert a claim for ineffective assistance of counsel a defendant must prove
5 that he was denied "reasonably effective assistance" of counsel by satisfying the two-prong
6 test of Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 686-87, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 2063-64 (1984). See
7 also State v. Love, 109 Nev. 1136, 1138, 865 P.2d 322, 323 (1993). Under this test, the
8 defendant must show (1) that his counsel's representation fell below an objective standard of
9 reasonableness, and (2) that but for counsel's errors, there is a reasonable probability that the
10 result of the proceedings would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S. at 687-88, 694, 104
11 S.Ct. at 2065, 2068; Warden, Nevada State Prison v. Lyons, 100 Nev. 430, 432, 683 P.2d
12 504, 505 (1984) (adopting Strickland two-part test in Nevada). "Effective counsel does not
13 mean errorless counsel, but rather counsel whose assistance is '[w]ithin the range of
14 competence demanded of attorneys in criminal cases.'" Jackson v. Warden, Nevada State
15 Prison, 91 Nev. 430, 432, 537 P.2d 473, 474 (1975), quoting McMann v. Richardson, 397
16 U.S. 759, 771, 90 S.Ct. 1441, 1449 (1970).

17 2. A defendant who contends that his attorney was ineffective because he did not
18 conduct an adequate investigation must show how a better investigation would have made a
19 more favorable outcome probable. Molina v. State, 120 Nev. 185, 87 P.3d 533 (2004).

20 3. Claims asserted in a petition for post-conviction relief must be supported with specific
21 factual allegations, which if true, would entitle the petitioner to relief. Hargrove v. State, 100
22 Nev. 498, 502, 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984).

23 4. "Trial counsel need not lodge futile objections to avoid ineffective assistance of
24 counsel claims." Ennis v. State, 122 Nev. 694, 137 P.3d 1095, 1103 (2006).

25 5. According to NRS 48.025, all relevant evidence is admissible, and all irrelevant
26 evidence is inadmissible.

27 6. The "trial lawyer alone is entrusted with decisions regarding legal tactics such as
28 deciding which witnesses to call." Rhyne v. State, 118 Nev. 1, 38 P.3d 163 (2002).

1 Similarly, how to cross examine the state's witnesses is a decision within the discretion of
2 the individual attorney. Id.

3 7. "If there is no bona fide defense to the charge, counsel cannot create one and may
4 disserve the interests of his client by attempting a useless charade." U.S. v. Cronin, 466 U.S.
5 648, 657 (1984) fn. 19.

6 8. An actual conflict of interest between an attorney and a client which adversely affects
7 the attorney's performance will result in a presumption of prejudice to the defendant. Clark
8 v. State, 108 Nev. 324, 326, 831 P.2d 1374, 1376 (1992) (citing Mannon v. State, 98 Nev.
9 224, 226, 645 P.2d 433, 434 (1982)).

10 9. "Conflict of interest and divided loyalty situations can take many forms, and whether
11 an actual conflict exists must be evaluated on the specific facts of each case. In general, a
12 conflict exists when an attorney is placed in a situation conducive to divided loyalties." Id.
13 (quoting Smith v. Lockhart, 923 F.2d 1314, 1320 (8th Cir.1991)).

14 10. A defendant is not entitled to reject his court-appointed counsel and request
15 substitution of other counsel without a showing of adequate cause for the change. Junior v.
16 State, 91 Nev. 439, 441, 537 P.2d 1204, 1206 (1975). The decision whether an actual
17 conflict exists between the attorney and the client is within the sound discretion of the trial
18 court, and should not be disturbed on appeal absent a clear showing of abuse. Thomas v.
19 State, 94 Nev. 605, 584 P.2d 674 (1978).

20 11. NRS 51.055 reads:

21 1. A declarant is "unavailable as a witness" if he is:

- 22 (a) Exempted by ruling of the judge on the ground of privilege from testifying
23 concerning the subject matter of his statement;
24 (b) Persistent in refusing to testify despite an order of the judge to do so;
25 (c) Unable to be present or to testify at the hearing because of death or then
26 existing physical or mental illness or infirmity; or
27 (d) Absent from the hearing and beyond the jurisdiction of the court to compel
28 appearance and the proponent of his statement has exercised reasonable
diligence but has been unable to procure his attendance or to take his
deposition.

1 2. A declarant is not "unavailable as a witness" if his exemption, refusal,
2 inability or absence is due to the procurement or wrongdoing of the proponent
3 of his statement for the purpose of preventing the witness from attending or
4 testifying.

5 12. Even if one construes an attorney's statement as a concession of guilt, such
6 concessions may sometimes be a valuable strategic tool. Not only can a concession be a
7 reasonable trial tactic where there is overwhelming evidence of guilt, but it may also help to
8 make concessions in preparation of arguing mitigation in preparation of the penalty phase.
9 See People v. Bolin, 18 Cal.4th 297, 75 Cal.Rptr.2d 412 (1998).

10 13. A prosecutor has "a duty to refrain from making statements in opening arguments
11 that cannot be proved at trial." Rice v. State, 113 Nev. 1300, 1312, 949 P.2d 262, 270
12 (1997). Furthermore, "[e]ven if the prosecutor overstates in his opening statement what he is
13 later able to prove at trial, misconduct does not lie unless the prosecutor makes these
14 statements in bad faith." Id. at 1312-1313, 949 P.2d at 270.

15 14. A trial court will only grant a mistrial on its own motion when there is presentation
16 of evidence so inherently prejudicial that the declaration of a mistrial is necessary. Baker v.
17 State, 89 Nev. 87, 88, 506 P.2d 1261 (1973).

18 15. District courts have broad discretion in settling jury instructions and may only be
19 reviewed where there is a clear showing of an abuse of discretion or judicial error. Jackson v.
20 State, 117 Nev. 116, 120, 17 P.3d 998, 1000 (2001). An abuse of discretion only occurs if
21 the district court's decision is "arbitrary or capricious or if it exceeds the bounds of law or
22 reason." Id. Claims concerning errant jury instructions are subject to a harmless error
23 standard of review. Barnier v. State, 119 Nev. 129, 132, 67 P.3d 320, 322 (2003).

24 16. The trial court need not use a defendant's proposed jury instructions where "a
25 defendant's proposed jury instructions on the theory of his case if his theory is substantially
26 covered by other instructions. Crawford v. State, 121 Nev. 744, 121 P.3d 582, 589 (2004)."

27 17. Similar to the standard used to show an ineffective assistance of trial counsel, the
28 Strickland test is also used for claims of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel. First, the
defendant must show a severe deficiency in representation. Then, the defendant must show
that the omitted issue would have a reasonable probability of success on appeal. Rippo v.

1 State, -- Nev. --, 146 P.3d 279, 285 (2006). Likewise, appellate counsel has no constitutional
2 duty to raise every non-frivolous issue requested by a defendant on appeal. Jones v. Barnes,
3 463 U.S. 745, 751 (1983). There is a strong presumption that appellate counsel's
4 performance was reasonable and fell within "the wide range of reasonable professional
5 assistance." See United States v. Aguirre, 912 F.2d 555, 560 (2nd Cir. 1990); citing
6 Strickland, 466 U.S. at 689, 104 S.Ct. at 2065.

7 18. This Court has held that all appeals must be "pursued in a manner meeting high
8 standards of diligence, professionalism and competence." Burke v. State, 110 Nev. 1366,
9 1368, 887 P.2d 267, 268 (1994). In Jones v. Barnes, 463 U.S. 745, 751, 103 S.Ct. 3308,
10 3312 (1983), the Supreme Court recognized that part of professional diligence and
11 competence involves "winnowing out weaker arguments on appeal and focusing on one
12 central issue if possible, or at most on a few key issues." Id. at 751 -752, 103 S.Ct. at 3313.
13 In particular, a "brief that raises every colorable issue runs the risk of burying good
14 arguments . . . in a verbal mound made up of strong and weak contentions." Id. 753, 103
15 S.Ct. at 3313. The Court also held that, "for judges to second-guess reasonable professional
16 judgments and impose on appointed counsel a duty to raise every 'colorable' claim suggested
17 by a client would disserve the very goal of vigorous and effective advocacy." Id. at 754, 103
18 S.Ct. at 3314.

19 19. Appellate counsel will not be deemed ineffective for not "federalizing" an issue. See
20 Browning v. State, 120 Nev. 347, 365, 91 P.3d 39, 52 (2004).

21 20. Appellate counsel is not required to make futile objections or file frivolous motions
22 where there is not a legal basis to do so. Ennis v. State, 122 Nev. 694, 137 P.3d 1095, 1103
23 (2006).

24 21. Relevant factors to consider in evaluating a claim of cumulative error are (1) whether
25 the issue of guilt is close, (2) the quantity and character of the error, and (3) the gravity of
26 the crime charged. Mulder v. State, 116 Nev. 1, 17, 992 P.2d 845, 854 - 855 (2000); see also
27 Big Pond v. State, 101 Nev. 1, 692 P.2d 1288 (1985).

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

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Petition for Post-Conviction relief shall be, and it is, hereby denied.



DATED this 27 day of December, 2007.


DISTRICT JUDGE

 DAVID BARKER

DAVID ROGER
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Nevada Bar #002781

BY


 H. LEON SIMON
Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar #000411

ORIGINAL

FILED

1 NOED

2 DISTRICT COURT

JAN 8 12 35 PM '08

3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4 *Charles J. Short*
CLERK OF THE COURT

5 GLENFORD BUDD,

6 Petitioner,

7 vs.

8 THE STATE OF NEVADA,

9 Respondent,

Case No: C193182
Dept No: XVIII

10 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF
DECISION AND ORDER

11 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 7, 2008, the court entered a decision or order in this matter, a
12 true and correct copy of which is attached to this notice.

13 You may appeal to the Supreme Court from the decision or order of this court. If you wish to appeal, you
14 must file a notice of appeal with the clerk of this court within thirty-three (33) days after the date this notice is
15 mailed to you. This notice was mailed on January 8, 2008.

16 CHARLES J. SHORT, CLERK OF THE COURT

17 By: *Brandi J. Wendel*

18 Brandi J. Wendel, Deputy Clerk

19 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

20 I hereby certify that on this 8 day of January 2008, I placed a copy of this Notice of Entry of Decision and
21 Order in:

22 The bin(s) located in the Office of the Clerk of the Court:
23 Clark County District Attorney's Office
Attorney General's Office - Appellate Division

- 24 ☒ The United States mail addressed as follows:
25 Glenford Budd # 90043
26 P.O. Box 1989
Ely, NV 89301

27 *Brandi J. Wendel*
28 Brandi J. Wendel, Deputy Clerk

ORIGINAL

FILED

JAN 7 1 21 PM '03

CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **ORDR**
2 **DAVID ROGER**
3 **Clark County District Attorney**
4 **Nevada Bar #002781**
5 **H. LEON SIMON**
6 **Deputy District Attorney**
7 **Nevada Bar #000411**
8 **200 Lewis Avenue**
9 **Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212**
10 **(702) 671-2500**
11 **Attorney for Plaintiff**

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

GLENFORD BUDD,
#1900089

Defendant.

CASE NO: C193182

DEPT NO: XVIII

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW AND ORDER

DATE OF HEARING: November 28, 2007
TIME OF HEARING: 8:15 A.M.

THIS CAUSE having come on for hearing before the Honorable DAVID BARKER,
District Judge, on the ^{30th} 28th day of November, 2007, the Petitioner not being present,
Proceeding in Forma Pauperis, the Respondent being represented by DAVID ROGER,
District Attorney, by and through DAVID STANTON, Deputy District Attorney, and the
Court having considered the matter, including briefs, transcripts, arguments of counsel, and
documents on file herein, now therefore, the Court makes the following findings of fact and
conclusions of law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On May 29, 2003, Glenford Budd (hereinafter "Defendant") was charged with three
(3) counts of Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon. After a preliminary hearing, a
magistrate ordered Defendant to answer the charges in District Court.

RECEIVED

JAN 7 2008

CLERK OF THE COURT

1 2. The State filed an Information on June 26, 2003. At the initial arraignment on July 2,
2 2003, Defendant pled not guilty to the charges.

3 3. The matter was set for trial which commenced on December 5, 2005. After the trial,
4 the jury returned three (3) guilty verdicts of First Degree Murder with Use of a Deadly
5 Weapon on December 13, 2005.

6 4. On December 16, 2005, Defendant was sentenced to three life sentences without
7 possibility of parole, each with an equal and consecutive sentence for use of a deadly
8 weapon. Judgment of Conviction was filed on March 1, 2006.

9 5. On March 23, 2006, Defendant filed a Notice of Appeal. On January 9, 2007, the
10 Nevada Supreme Court filed an Order of Affirmance thereby affirming Defendant's
11 conviction.

12 6. On July 5, 2007, Defendant filed a pro per motion to have his trial attorney held in
13 contempt. On July 23, 2007, Defendant's motion was denied. On August 10, 2007,
14 Defendant filed another Notice of Appeal regarding the denial to hold his attorney in
15 contempt. On September 11, 2007, the matter was closed by the Supreme Court.

16 7. On September 21, 2007, Defendant filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus (post-
17 conviction). The State responded on November 27, 2007.

18 8. Defendant received effective assistance of counsel.

19 a. Counsel was not ineffective for failing to object to a witness's testimony
20 regarding the fact that Defendant was angry about losing some marijuana
21 because such an objection would have been futile.

22 b. Counsel was not ineffective for failing to object to an eyewitness's testimony
23 because this was a strategic decision.

24 c. Counsel was not ineffective for failing to call certain witness because counsel
25 alone is entrusted with decisions regarding legal tactics.

26 d. Counsel was effective when he raised an objection to the admission of the
27 transcribed testimony of Winston Budd.

28 e. Counsel was not ineffective for posing a hypothetical stating that the State has

1 only managed to prove second-degree murder. Regardless of whether or not
2 this is considered an admission of guilt, such a concession may be a reasonable
3 trial tactic.

4 f. Counsel was not ineffective for not calling a handwriting expert to examine a
5 letter that was alleged to have been written by the victim because this was a
6 strategic decision.

7 g. Counsel was not ineffective for not objecting to jury instructions seven (7) and
8 nineteen (19) because such objections would be futile.

9 9. The District Court properly ruled on Defendant's allegation of a conflict with his
10 counsel because Defendant's claim that his counsel failed to inform the District Court of a
11 conflict of interest is entirely contradictory to the record.

12 10. This Court properly admitted the transcribed testimony of Winston Budd because the
13 witness was determined to be unavailable per NRS 51.055.

14 11. Defendant incorrectly asserts that the State did not disclose an agreement it had with
15 one of its witnesses.

16 12. There was no prosecutorial misconduct.

17 13. This Court was not required *sua sponte* to order a mistrial because there was no cause
18 in this case to do so. The State did not say anything that was inherently prejudicial. The
19 prosecutor simply informed the jurors of the information that would be presented at trial. In
20 referring to the testimony of unavailable witnesses, the prosecutor fully expected the
21 previous testimony to be entered into evidence as this Court had already ruled on the matter
22 in favor of the State.

23 14. The jury instructions in this case were proper.

24 15. Defendant received effective assistance of appellate counsel.

25 a. Defendant's appellate counsel was not ineffective for failing to federalize
26 issues in Defendant's case.

27 b. Defendant's appellate counsel need not raise futile objections or file frivolous
28 motions where there is not a legal basis to do so.

1 16. There was no cumulative error in this case.

2
3 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

4 1. In order to assert a claim for ineffective assistance of counsel a defendant must prove
5 that he was denied "reasonably effective assistance" of counsel by satisfying the two-prong
6 test of Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 686-87, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 2063-64 (1984). See
7 also State v. Love, 109 Nev. 1136, 1138, 865 P.2d 322, 323 (1993). Under this test, the
8 defendant must show (1) that his counsel's representation fell below an objective standard of
9 reasonableness, and (2) that but for counsel's errors, there is a reasonable probability that the
10 result of the proceedings would have been different. Strickland, 466 U.S. at 687-88, 694, 104
11 S.Ct. at 2065, 2068; Warden, Nevada State Prison v. Lyons, 100 Nev. 430, 432, 683 P.2d
12 504, 505 (1984) (adopting Strickland two-part test in Nevada). "Effective counsel does not
13 mean errorless counsel, but rather counsel whose assistance is '[w]ithin the range of
14 competence demanded of attorneys in criminal cases.'" Jackson v. Warden, Nevada State
15 Prison, 91 Nev. 430, 432, 537 P.2d 473, 474 (1975), quoting McMann v. Richardson, 397
16 U.S. 759, 771, 90 S.Ct. 1441, 1449 (1970).

17 2. A defendant who contends that his attorney was ineffective because he did not
18 conduct an adequate investigation must show how a better investigation would have made a
19 more favorable outcome probable. Molina v. State, 120 Nev. 185, 87 P.3d 533 (2004).

20 3. Claims asserted in a petition for post-conviction relief must be supported with specific
21 factual allegations, which if true, would entitle the petitioner to relief. Hargrove v. State, 100
22 Nev. 498, 502, 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984).

23 4. "Trial counsel need not lodge futile objections to avoid ineffective assistance of
24 counsel claims." Ennis v. State, 122 Nev. 694, 137 P.3d 1095, 1103 (2006).

25 5. According to NRS 48.025, all relevant evidence is admissible, and all irrelevant
26 evidence is inadmissible.

27 6. The "trial lawyer alone is entrusted with decisions regarding legal tactics such as
28 deciding which witnesses to call." Rhyne v. State, 118 Nev. 1, 38 P.3d 163 (2002).

1 Similarly, how to cross examine the state's witnesses is a decision within the discretion of
2 the individual attorney. Id.

3 7. "If there is no bona fide defense to the charge, counsel cannot create one and may
4 disserve the interests of his client by attempting a useless charade." U.S. v. Cronie, 466 U.S.
5 648, 657 (1984) fn. 19.

6 8. An actual conflict of interest between an attorney and a client which adversely affects
7 the attorney's performance will result in a presumption of prejudice to the defendant. Clark
8 v. State, 108 Nev. 324, 326, 831 P.2d 1374, 1376 (1992) (citing Mannon v. State, 98 Nev.
9 224, 226, 645 P.2d 433, 434 (1982)).

10 9. "Conflict of interest and divided loyalty situations can take many forms, and whether
11 an actual conflict exists must be evaluated on the specific facts of each case. In general, a
12 conflict exists when an attorney is placed in a situation conducive to divided loyalties." Id.
13 (quoting Smith v. Lockhart, 923 F.2d 1314, 1320 (8th Cir.1991)).

14 10. A defendant is not entitled to reject his court-appointed counsel and request
15 substitution of other counsel without a showing of adequate cause for the change. Junior v.
16 State, 91 Nev. 439, 441, 537 P.2d 1204, 1206 (1975). The decision whether an actual
17 conflict exists between the attorney and the client is within the sound discretion of the trial
18 court, and should not be disturbed on appeal absent a clear showing of abuse. Thomas v.
19 State, 94 Nev. 605, 584 P.2d 674 (1978).

20 11. NRS 51.055 reads:

21 1. A declarant is "unavailable as a witness" if he is:

- 22 (a) Exempted by ruling of the judge on the ground of privilege from testifying
23 concerning the subject matter of his statement;
24 (b) Persistent in refusing to testify despite an order of the judge to do so;
25 (c) Unable to be present or to testify at the hearing because of death or then
26 existing physical or mental illness or infirmity; or
27 (d) Absent from the hearing and beyond the jurisdiction of the court to compel
28 appearance and the proponent of his statement has exercised reasonable
diligence but has been unable to procure his attendance or to take his
deposition.

1 2. A declarant is not "unavailable as a witness" if his exemption, refusal,
2 inability or absence is due to the procurement or wrongdoing of the proponent
3 of his statement for the purpose of preventing the witness from attending or
4 testifying.

5 12. Even if one construes an attorney's statement as a concession of guilt, such
6 concessions may sometimes be a valuable strategic tool. Not only can a concession be a
7 reasonable trial tactic where there is overwhelming evidence of guilt, but it may also help to
8 make concessions in preparation of arguing mitigation in preparation of the penalty phase.
9 See People v. Bolin, 18 Cal.4th 297, 75 Cal.Rptr.2d 412 (1998).

10 13. A prosecutor has "a duty to refrain from making statements in opening arguments
11 that cannot be proved at trial." Rice v. State, 113 Nev. 1300, 1312, 949 P.2d 262, 270
12 (1997). Furthermore, "[e]ven if the prosecutor overstates in his opening statement what he is
13 later able to prove at trial, misconduct does not lie unless the prosecutor makes these
14 statements in bad faith." Id. at 1312-1313, 949 P.2d at 270.

15 14. A trial court will only grant a mistrial on its own motion when there is presentation
16 of evidence so inherently prejudicial that the declaration of a mistrial is necessary. Baker v.
17 State, 89 Nev. 87, 88, 506 P.2d 1261 (1973).

18 15. District courts have broad discretion in settling jury instructions and may only be
19 reviewed where there is a clear showing of an abuse of discretion or judicial error. Jackson v.
20 State, 117 Nev. 116, 120, 17 P.3d 998, 1000 (2001). An abuse of discretion only occurs if
21 the district court's decision is "arbitrary or capricious or if it exceeds the bounds of law or
22 reason." Id. Claims concerning errant jury instructions are subject to a harmless error
23 standard of review. Barnier v. State, 119 Nev. 129, 132, 67 P.3d 320, 322 (2003).

24 16. The trial court need not use a defendant's proposed jury instructions where "a
25 defendant's proposed jury instructions on the theory of his case if his theory is substantially
26 covered by other instructions. Crawford v. State, 121 Nev. 744, 121 P.3d 582, 589 (2004)."

27 17. Similar to the standard used to show an ineffective assistance of trial counsel, the
28 Strickland test is also used for claims of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel. First, the
defendant must show a severe deficiency in representation. Then, the defendant must show
that the omitted issue would have a reasonable probability of success on appeal. Rippo v.

1 State, -- Nev. --, 146 P.3d 279, 285 (2006). Likewise, appellate counsel has no constitutional
2 duty to raise every non-frivolous issue requested by a defendant on appeal. Jones v. Barnes,
3 463 U.S. 745, 751 (1983). There is a strong presumption that appellate counsel's
4 performance was reasonable and fell within "the wide range of reasonable professional
5 assistance." See United States v. Aguirre, 912 F.2d 555, 560 (2nd Cir. 1990); citing
6 Strickland, 466 U.S. at 689, 104 S.Ct. at 2065.

7 18. This Court has held that all appeals must be "pursued in a manner meeting high
8 standards of diligence, professionalism and competence." Burke v. State, 110 Nev. 1366,
9 1368, 887 P.2d 267, 268 (1994). In Jones v. Barnes, 463 U.S. 745, 751, 103 S.Ct. 3308,
10 3312 (1983), the Supreme Court recognized that part of professional diligence and
11 competence involves "winnowing out weaker arguments on appeal and focusing on one
12 central issue if possible, or at most on a few key issues." Id. at 751 -752, 103 S.Ct. at 3313.
13 In particular, a "brief that raises every colorable issue runs the risk of burying good
14 arguments . . . in a verbal mound made up of strong and weak contentions." Id. 753, 103
15 S.Ct. at 3313. The Court also held that, "for judges to second-guess reasonable professional
16 judgments and impose on appointed counsel a duty to raise every 'colorable' claim suggested
17 by a client would disserve the very goal of vigorous and effective advocacy." Id. at 754, 103
18 S.Ct. at 3314.

19 19. Appellate counsel will not be deemed ineffective for not "federalizing" an issue. See
20 Browning v. State, 120 Nev. 347, 365, 91 P.3d 39, 52 (2004).

21 20. Appellate counsel is not required to make futile objections or file frivolous motions
22 where there is not a legal basis to do so. Ennis v. State, 122 Nev. 694, 137 P.3d 1095, 1103
23 (2006).


24 21. Relevant factors to consider in evaluating a claim of cumulative error are (1) whether
25 the issue of guilt is close, (2) the quantity and character of the error, and (3) the gravity of
26 the crime charged. Mulder v. State, 116 Nev. 1, 17, 992 P.2d 845, 854 - 855 (2000); see also
27 Big Pond v. State, 101 Nev. 1, 692 P.2d 1288 (1985).

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

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Petition for Post-Conviction relief shall be, and it is, hereby denied.

DATED this 27th day of December, 2007.




DISTRICT JUDGE



DAVID BARKER

DAVID ROGER
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Nevada Bar #002781

BY 
H. LEON SIMON
Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar #000411

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A

2/23/04 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
006541	Lewis, Linda Y.	Y
0001 D1	Budd, Glenford A	Y
PUBDEF	Public Defender	Y
003374	Brooks, Howard S.	Y

7/19/04 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 001

05/24/04 09:00 AM 00 STATE'S REQUEST RESET TRIAL DATE

HEARD BY: Joseph S. Pavlikowski, Senior Judge; Dept. VJ30

OFFICERS: Amber Farley, Court Clerk
Liz Garcia, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.
000398 Schwartz, David P.

0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PUBDEF Public Defender
003374 Brooks, Howard S.

Y
Y
Y

Y
Y
Y

Mr. Brooks stated the Defendant has waived his speedy trial rights, and counsel have agreed on a November date. COURT ORDERED, request GRANTED; trial date vacated and re-set.

CUSTODY

11/10/04 9:00 AM CALENDAR CALL

11/15/04 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL

10/27/04 09:00 AM 00 ALL PENDING MOTIONS 10-27-04

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
000398 Schwartz, David P.
005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.

0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PUBDEF Public Defender
003374 Brooks, Howard S.
006762 O'Brien, Timothy P.

Y
Y
Y

Y
Y
Y
Y

DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #1-14

Court stated parties met in chambers and determined that it would be appropriate to take all the motions off calendar and to be reset at the calendar call as there are issues regarding aggravators's in front of the Supreme Court. COURT ORDERED, Motions OFF CALENDAR and matter set for status check to reset to motions.

CONTINUED ON PAGE: 003

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 002

CUSTODY

11/10/04 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: RESET MOTIONS

11/10/04 09:00 AM 00 ALL PENDING MOTIONS 11-10-04

HEARD BY: Michael A Cherry, Judge; Dept. 17

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/RecorderPARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PUBDEF Public Defender
003374 Brooks, Howard S.Y
Y
Y
Y
Y

CALENDAR CALL...STATUS CHECK: RESET DEFT'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE 1-14

Mr. Brooks stated the trial is being continued and Deft's motions will need to be reset. COURT ORDERED, Trial VACATED and RESET along with Deft's Motions in Limine 1-14.

CUSTODY

1/12/05 10:30 AM DEFT'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE 1-14

4/27/05 9:00 AM CALENDAR CALL

5/02/05 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A
CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 003

01/12/05 10:30 AM 00 ALL PENDING MOTIONS 1-12-05

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
000398	Schwartz, David P.	Y
0001 D1	Budd, Glenford A	Y
PUBDEF	Public Defender	Y
003374	Brooks, Howard S.	Y

DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE 1-14

Mr. Brooks request a continuance as there are issues that still need to be investigated. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

CUSTODY

CONTINUED TO: 4/04/05 10:30 AM

04/20/05 09:00 AM 00 ALL PENDING MOTIONS 4-20-05

HEARD BY: Kathy Hardcastle, Chief Judge; Dept. 4

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
000398	Schwartz, David P.	Y
005734	Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
0001 D1	Budd, Glenford A	Y
PUBDEF	Public Defender	Y
003374	Brooks, Howard S.	Y

DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #1 FOR ORDER PROHIBITING PROSECUTION MISCONDUCT IN ARGUMENT; AND FOR ORDER THAT COURT TAKES JUDICIAL NOTICE OF AUTHORITY CITED IN THIS MOTION IF DEFENSE OBJECTS AT TRIAL TO IMPROPER ARGUMENT...DEFT'S MOTION #2 FOR EXCHANGE OF JURY INSTRUCTIONS ON THE FIRST DAY OF TRIAL... DEFT'S MOTION #3 FOR RECORDING OF ALL PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 250...DEFT'S MOTION #4 TO DISQUALIFY ALL POTENTIAL JURORS WHO KNEW OR WERE ACQUAINTED WITH THE VICTIMS OR THEIR FAMILIES...DEFT'S MOTION #5 TO DISQUALIFY ALL POTENTIAL JURORS WHO WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IN THE EVENT OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER CONVICTION...DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #6 TO PROHIBIT THE STATE FROM USING PREEMPTORY CHALLENGES TO REMOVE MINORITIES FROM JURY...DEFT'S MOTION #7 TO BIFURCATE PENALTY PHASE

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 004

PROCEEDINGS...DEFT'S MOTION #8 TO ALLOW THE DEFENSE TO ARGUE LAST IN A POTENTIAL PENALTY PHASE PROCEEDINGS...DEFT'S MOTION #9 FOR JURY QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE COMPLETED BY JURY VENIRE ONE WEEK PRIOR TO TRIAL... DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #10 TO PROHIBIT ANY REFERENCE IN FRONT OF THE JURY TO THE TRIAL PHASE OF THE PROCEEDINGS AS THE "GUILT PHASE"...DEFT'S MOTION #11 TO STRIKE ALLEGATIONS OF CERTAIN AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES ALLEGED IN STATE'S NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK DEATH PENALTY...DEFT'S MOTION #12 TO PRECLUDE THE ADMISSION, DURING A POSSIBLE PENALTY PROCEEDING OF EVIDENCE ABOUT THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF THE VICTIMS AND THE IMPACT OF THE VICTIM'S DEATHS ON THE FAMILY...DEFT'S MOTION #13 TO BAR THE ADMISSION OF CUMULATIVE VICTIM IMPACT EVIDENCE IN VIOLATION OF THE DUE PROCESS LAW...DEFT'S MOTION #14 TO DISMISS THE STATE'S NOTICE OF INTENT BECAUSE NEVADA'S DEATH PENALTY SCHEME VIOLATES DUE PROCESS GUARANTEES BY FAILING TO REQUIRE A PRE-TRIAL FINDING OF PROBABLE CAUSE FOR ALLEGED AGGRAVATORS

COURT ORDERED, Trial dates VACATED and RESET and all motions CONTINUED.

CUSTODY

CONTINUED TO: 8/01/05 9:00 AM

11/23/05 9:00 AM CALENDAR CALL

11/28/05 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL (FIRM)

11/02/05 09:00 AM 00 ALL PENDING MOTIONS 11-02-05

HEARD BY: David Wall, Judge; Dept. 20

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Angela Lee, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
009210 Tomsheck, Joshua L.

0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A

Y

Y

Y

DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #1 FOR ORDER PROHIBITING PROSECUTION MISCONDUCT IN ARGUMENT; AND FOR ORDER THAT COURT TAKES JUDICIAL NOTICE OF AUTHORITY CITED IN THIS MOTION IF DEFENSE OBJECTS AT TRIAL TO IMPROPER ARGUMENT...DEFT'S MOTION #2 FOR EXCHANGE OF JURY INSTRUCTIONS ON THE FIRST DAY OF TRIAL... DEFT'S MOTION #3 FOR RECORDING OF ALL PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 250...DEFT'S MOTION #4 TO DISQUALIFY ALL POTENTIAL JURORS WHO KNEW OR WERE ACQUAINTED WITH THE VICTIMS OR THEIR FAMILIES...DEFT'S MOTION #5 TO DISQUALIFY ALL POTENTIAL JURORS WHO WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IN THE EVENT OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER CONVICTION...DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #6 TO PROHIBIT THE STATE FROM USING PREEMPTORY CHALLENGES TO REMOVE MINORITIES FROM JURY...DEFT'S MOTION #7 TO BIFURCATE PENALTY PHASE PROCEEDINGS...DEFT'S MOTION #8 TO ALLOW THE DEFENSE TO ARGUE LAST IN A

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 005

POTENTIAL PENALTY PHASE PROCEEDINGS...DEFT'S MOTION #9 FOR JURY QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE COMPLETED BY JURY VENIRE ONE WEEK PRIOR TO TRIAL... DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #10 TO PROHIBIT ANY REFERENCE IN FRONT OF THE JURY TO THE TRIAL PHASE OF THE PROCEEDINGS AS THE "GUILT PHASE"...DEFT'S MOTION #11 TO STRIKE ALLEGATIONS OF CERTAIN AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES ALLEGED IN STATE'S NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK DEATH PENALTY...DEFT'S MOTION #12 TO PRECLUDE THE ADMISSION, DURING A POSSIBLE PENALTY PROCEEDING OF EVIDENCE ABOUT THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF THE VICTIMS AND THE IMPACT OF THE VICTIMS' DEATHS ON THE FAMILY...DEFT'S MOTION #13 TO BAR THE ADMISSION OF CUMULATIVE VICTIM IMPACT EVIDENCE IN VIOLATION OF THE DUE PROCESS LAW...DEFT'S MOTION #14 TO DISMISS THE STATE'S NOTICE OF INTENT BECAUSE NEVADA'S DEATH PENALTY SCHEME VIOLATES DUE PROCESS GUARANTEES BY FAILING TO REQUIRE A PRE-TRIAL FINDING OF PROBABLE CAUSE FOR ALLEGED AGGRAVATORS

COURT ORDERED, Motions CONTINUED to the Calendar Call date.

CUSTODY

CONTINUED TO: 11/23/05 9:00 AM

11/14/05 09:00 AM 00 STATUS CHECK

HEARD BY: J. CHARLES THOMPSON, Senior Judge; Dept. VJ42

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
001438 Kane, Edward R.
005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.

0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PUBDEF Public Defender
003374 Brooks, Howard S.

Y
Y
Y

Y
Y
Y

Mr. Kane stated Mr. Brooks would like to start the trial on the following week. Following a conference at the Bench, COURT ORDERED, Trial date STANDS.

CUSTODY

CONTINUED ON PAGE: 007

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 006

11/23/05 09:00 AM 00 ALL PENDING MOTIONS 11-23-05

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
001438 Kane, Edward R.
005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.

0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PUBDEF Public Defender
003374 Brooks, Howard S.
006762 O'Brien, Timothy P.

Y
Y
Y

Y
Y
Y
Y

DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #1 FOR ORDER PROHIBITING PROSECUTION MISCONDUCT IN ARGUMENT; AND FOR ORDER THAT COURT TAKES JUDICIAL NOTICE OF AUTHORITY CITED IN THIS MOTION IF DEFENSE OBJECTS AT TRIAL TO IMPROPER ARGUMENT: COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED.

DEFT'S MOTION #2 FOR EXCHANGE OF JURY INSTRUCTIONS ON THE FIRST DAY OF TRIAL: COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED.

DEFT'S MOTION #3 FOR RECORDING OF ALL PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 250: COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED; a Court Reporter will be in court to provide daily transcripts.

DEFT'S MOTION #4 TO DISQUALIFY ALL POTENTIAL JURORS WHO KNEW OR WERE ACQUAINTED WITH THE VICTIMS OR THEIR FAMILIES: COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED but may be revisited.

DEFT'S MOTION #5 TO DISQUALIFY ALL POTENTIAL JURORS WHO WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IN THE EVENT OF A FIRST DEGREE MURDER CONVICTION: COURT ORDERED, Motion DEFERRED until the issue arises.

DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #6 TO PROHIBIT THE STATE FROM USING PREEMPTORY CHALLENGES TO REMOVE MINORITIES FROM JURY: COURT ORDERED, Motion DEFERRED.

DEFT'S MOTION #7 TO BIFURCATE PENALTY PHASE PROCEEDINGS: COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED.

DEFT'S MOTION #8 TO ALLOW THE DEFENSE TO ARGUE LAST IN A POTENTIAL PENALTY PHASE PROCEEDINGS: COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED.

DEFT'S MOTION #9 FOR JURY QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE COMPLETED BY JURY VENIRE ONE WEEK PRIOR TO TRIAL: COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED. Court DIRECTED counsel to agree on a format and to submit it to the Jury Commissioner.

DEFT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #10 TO PROHIBIT ANY REFERENCE IN FRONT OF THE JURY

CONTINUED ON PAGE: 008

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 007

TO THE TRIAL PHASE OF THE PROCEEDINGS AS THE "GUILT PHASE": COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED.

DEFT'S MOTION #11 TO STRIKE ALLEGATIONS OF CERTAIN AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES ALLEGED IN STATE'S NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK DEATH PENALTY: COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED.

DEFT'S MOTION #12 TO PRECLUDE THE ADMISSION, DURING A POSSIBLE PENALTY PROCEEDING OF EVIDENCE ABOUT THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF THE VICTIMS AND THE IMPACT OF THE VICTIMS' DEATHS ON THE FAMILY: COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED.

DEFT'S MOTION #13 TO BAR THE ADMISSION OF CUMULATIVE VICTIM IMPACT EVIDENCE IN VIOLATION OF THE DUE PROCESS LAW: COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED.

DEFT'S MOTION #14 TO DISMISS THE STATE'S NOTICE OF INTENT BECAUSE NEVADA'S DEATH PENALTY SCHEME VIOLATES DUE PROCESS GUARANTEES BY FAILING TO REQUIRE A PRE-TRIAL FINDING OF PROBABLE CAUSE FOR ALLEGED AGGRAVATORS: COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED.

CALENDAR CALL: Counsel announced ready. COURT ORDERED, Trial date STANDS and will start at 1:30 pm.

CUSTODY

12/05/05 01:30 PM 00 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Gayle Picherri, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
001438	Kane, Edward R.	Y
005734	Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
0001 D1	Budd, Glenford A	Y
PUBDEF	Public Defender	Y
003374	Brooks, Howard S.	Y
006762	O'Brien, Timothy P.	Y

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURY: Colloquy between Court and counsel regarding the jury questionnaire's. Mr. O'Brien advised the Court that the deft. is requesting the Public Defender's office withdraw and the deft. would like to retain Mr. Momot as counsel. Colloquy between Court and counsel regarding the relationship between counsel and the deft. Court stated it is not going to continue the trial; deft's request is not timely and ORDERED, the Public Defender's office to remain as counsel. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, the official record for this trial will be the Court Reporter and not the Court Recorder based on the need for daily transcripts.

CONTINUED ON PAGE: 009

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 008

PROSPECTIVE JURY PRESENT: Voir dire. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

CONTINUED TO: 12/06/05 01:30 PM 01

12/06/05 01:30 PM 01 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Gayle Pichierri, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
001438	Kane, Edward R.	Y
005734	Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
0001 D1	Budd, Glenford A	Y
PUBDEF	Public Defender	Y
003374	Brooks, Howard S.	Y
006762	O'Brien, Timothy P.	Y

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURY: At the request of counsel, COURT ORDERED, Jury Questionnaire's will be sealed and made a part of the record. Argument by Mr. Brooks regarding the lack of cooperation by the deft's family. Court advised the deft. to encourage his family to cooperate with his attorney's.

PROSPECTIVE JURY PRESENT: Continued voir dire. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

CONTINUED TO: 12/08/05 10:00 AM 02

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 009

12/08/05 10:00 AM 02 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Gayle Pichierri, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
	001438 Kane, Edward R.	Y
	005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
	0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A	Y
	PUBDEF Public Defender	Y
	003374 Brooks, Howard S.	Y
	006762 O'Brien, Timothy P.	Y

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURY: Arguments by counsel regarding the use of the preliminary hearing transcript of Winston Budd. COURT ORDERED, the transcript of Winston Budd will be allowed to be introduced in lieu of the witnesses presence. Arguments by counsel regarding the use of the 911 tape. COURT ORDERED, 911 will be ALLOWED. Juror #104 present and questioned by Court and counsel.

PROSPECTIVE JURY PRESENT: Jury and 2 alternates selected and sworn. Opening statements by counsel.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Mr. Brooks noted for the record the racial make-up of the jury.

JURY PRESENT: Testimony and exhibits presented (See worksheets). COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

CONTINUED TO: 12/09/05 08:30 AM 03

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 010

12/09/05 08:30 AM 03 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Jennifer Kimmel, Relief Clerk
Janice David, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
001438	Kane, Edward R.	Y
005734	Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
0001 D1	Budd, Glenford A	Y
PUBDEF	Public Defender	Y
006762	O'Brien, Timothy P.	Y
003374	Brooks, Howard S.	Y

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Mr. Brooks advised that Mr. Leon Simon has him under subpoena and has been informed that this matter takes priority. Mr. Brooks waived any error relating to agreeing to reveal that the Defendant was incarcerated which will be revealed during Mr. Lewis's testimony about the correspondence. Mr. Brooks advised this is a trial strategy and any error that could be caused by the Jury finding out Defendant was incarcerated is WAIVED. Discussion ensued regarding scheduling of trial for the afternoon. Mr. Kane made reference to lecture by the Court made yesterday to the spectators in the audience. Discussion ensued regarding conduct of spectators and the Court and its Staff's response regarding same. Mr. Kane advised one of the victim's family members was approached by a Defendant counsel in the bathroom regarding whether or not they would be willing to testify at the Penalty Phase, should it go forward. Mr. Kane moved for a gentleman's agreement concerning mutual agreement not to approach and attempt to talk to the opposing side's family members, etc. Both Defendant's counsel agreed and the COURT SO ORDERED. JURY PRESENT: Testimony and exhibits continued. (See worksheets). Court admonished and excused the Jury for afternoon and ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. Mr. Brooks requested details concerning the number of feet from the witness' residence to the location of incident. Mr. Brooks advised his office formerly had a Greg Lewis as a client however this is not the Greg Lewis that will be involved in this case. Discussion ensued regarding Jury Instructions.

CONTINUED TO: 12/12/05 01:30 PM 04

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A
CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 011

12/12/05 01:30 PM 04 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Janice David, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
	001438 Kane, Edward R.	Y
	005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
	0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A	Y
	PUBDEF Public Defender	Y
	003374 Brooks, Howard S.	Y
	006762 O'Brien, Timothy P.	Y

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Mr. Brooks advised the Court that a stipulation was FILED IN OPEN COURT.

JURY PRESENT: Testimony and exhibits presented (See worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Court advised the deft. of his right to testify. Court noted the Carter instruction was given and deft. understands that he can not be compelled to testify.

JURY PRESENT: State rests. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Instructions settled on the record.

CONTINUED TO: 12/13/05 01:30 PM 05

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 012

12/13/05 01:30 PM 05 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jean Dahlberg, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
	001438 Kane, Edward R.	Y
	005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
	0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A	Y
	PUBDEF Public Defender	Y
	003374 Brooks, Howard S.	Y
	006762 O'Brien, Timothy P.	Y

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Mr. Brooks noted the correction that was made to the transcript of December 9, 2005. Mr. Brooks moved for a mistrial based on the fact that the State did have Mr. Richards testify which was brought up in opening statements. Arguments by counsel. COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED.

JURY PRESENT: Court instructed the jury. Closing arguments by counsel. At the hour of 4:10 pm, jury retired to deliberate. At the hour of 6:45 pm. jury returned with a verdict of GUILTY of COUNT 1 - FIRST DEGREE MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F); GUILTY of COUNT 2 - FIRST DEGREE MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F); and GUILTY of COUNT 3 - FIRST DEGREE MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F). COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED for the penalty phase.

CONTINUED TO: 12/14/05 10:30 AM 06

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 013

12/14/05 10:30 AM 06 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Janice David, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
001438	Kane, Edward R.	Y
005734	Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
0001 D1	Budd, Glenford A	Y
PUBDEF	Public Defender	Y
003374	Brooks, Howard S.	Y
006762	O'Brien, Timothy P.	Y

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Counsel requested the exclusionary rule be INVOKED, COURT SO ORDERED. Colloquy between Court and counsel regarding the instructions.

JURY PRESENT: Opening statements by counsel. Testimony and exhibits presented (See worksheets). State rests. Testimony and exhibits presented (See worksheets). COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

CONTINUED TO: 12/15/05 08:30 AM 07

12/15/05 08:30 AM 07 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jean Dahlberg, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES:	STATE OF NEVADA	Y
001438	Kane, Edward R.	Y
005734	Pandukht, Taleen R.	Y
0001 D1	Budd, Glenford A	Y
PUBDEF	Public Defender	Y
003374	Brooks, Howard S.	Y
006762	O'Brien, Timothy P.	Y

JURY PRESENT: Testimony and exhibits presented (See worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Court advised the deft. of his rights to make a sworn or unsworn statement. Conference at the Bench. Instructions settled on the record.

JURY PRESENT: Testimony and exhibits presented (See worksheets). Deft.

CONTINUED ON PAGE: 015

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 014

rests. Court instructed the jury. At the hour of 4:10 pm, jury retired to deliberate.

CONTINUED TO: 12/16/05 09:00 AM 08

12/16/05 09:00 AM 08 TRIAL BY JURY

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
001438 Kane, Edward R.
005734 Pandukht, Taleen R.

0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PUBDEF Public Defender
003374 Brooks, Howard S.
006762 O'Brien, Timothy P.

Y
Y
Y

Y
Y
Y
Y

CONTINUED DELIBERATIONS.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Court advised counsel of the questions from the jury. Upon Court's inquiry, counsel agreed to have the Court Recorder be the official record for this proceeding. Court Clerk read the questions for the record. Court and counsel agreed on an answer and provided the answer to the jury.

CONTINUED DELIBERATIONS.

JURY PRESENT: At the hour of 4:05 pm, Jury returned with a PENALTY VERDICT as to COUNT 1 - LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE; COUNT 2 - LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE; and COUNT 3 - LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. Court THANKED and EXCUSED the jury. COURT ORDERED, matter referred to the Division of Parole and Probation (P & P) and set for sentencing; Deft. REMANDED TO CUSTODY.

CUSTODY

2/01/06 9:00 AM SENTENCING

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A
CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 015

01/30/06 09:00 AM 00 STATUS CHECK (WITNESS)

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA Y
 001438 Kane, Edward R. Y
 0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A Y

At the request of counsel, COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED; FURTHER, Deft's sentencing CONTINUED.

CUSTODY

2/22/06 9:00 SENTENCING

CONTINUED TO: 02/15/06 09:00 AM 01

02/15/06 09:00 AM 01 STATUS CHECK (WITNESS)

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Michelle Jones/mj, Relief Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA Y
 005734 Pandukht, Taleen R. Y
 001438 Kane, Edward R. Y
 0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A Y
 PUBDEF Public Defender Y
 008638 Rivera-Rogers, Mariteresa Y

At the request of the State and there being no opposition, COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

CUSTODY

CONTINUED TO: 03/06/06 09:00 AM 02

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 016

02/22/06 09:00 AM 01 SENTENCING

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
 001438 Kane, Edward R.

 0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
 PUBDEF Public Defender
 003374 Brooks, Howard S.

Y
Y
Y
Y
Y

DEFT. BUDD ADJUDGED GUILTY of COUNT 1 - FIRST DEGREE MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F), COUNT 2 - FIRST DEGREE MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F) and COUNT 3 - FIRST DEGREE MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F). Argument by Mr. Kane. Speaker, Linda Moore, sworn and testified. Statement by Mr. Brooks. COURT ORDERED, in addition to the \$25 Administrative Assessment fee, \$150 DNA Analysis fee including testing to determine genetic markers and \$28,500 Restitution, Deft SENTENCED as to COUNT 1 - to LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE plus an equal and CONSECUTIVE LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE for use of a deadly weapon; as to COUNT 2 - to LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE plus an equal and CONSECUTIVE LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE for use of a deadly weapon to run CONSECUTIVE to Count 1; and as to COUNT 3 - to LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE plus an equal and CONSECUTIVE LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE for use of a deadly weapon to run CONSECUTIVE to Count 2 with 995 DAYS credit for time served.

NDC

03/06/06 09:00 AM 02 STATUS CHECK (WITNESS)

HEARD BY: Nancy M Saitta, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Kristen Brown, Court Clerk
Jo Anne Pierpont, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
 001438 Kane, Edward R.

Y
Y

Mr. Kane stated this matter is resolved. COURT ORDERED, matter OFF CALENDAR.

CONTINUED ON PAGE: 018

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 017

05/21/07 08:30 AM 00 ALL PENDING MOTIONS (5/21/07)

HEARD BY: David Barker, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Sharon Chun, Court Clerk
Richard Kangas, Reporter/RecorderPARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
007521 Smith, Sarah A.
0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PUBDEF Public Defender
006208 Avants, LynnY
Y
N
Y
YDEFT'S PRO PER MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS...DEFT'S PRO
PER MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD OR REQUEST FOR COURT
RECORDS/COURT CASE DOCUMENTSCOURT NOTED that Deft is incarcerated in the NV Dept of Corrections and not
present today.

COURT ORDERED, Deft's Pro Per Motion to Proceed Forma Pauperis, GRANTED.

COURT FURTHER ORDERED, Deft's Pro Per Motion for Withdrawal of Public
Defender as counsel and for Request for Court Records/Court Case Documents,
GRANTED. Mr. Avants stated he will contact prior counsel, Howard S. Brooks,
and will see that the records are forwarded to Deft Budd. COURT SO NOTED.

NDC

07/23/07 08:15 AM 00 DEFT'S PRO PER MTN TO HOLD HOWARD S
BROOKS ATTORNEY OF RECORD IN CONTEMPT/44

HEARD BY: David Barker, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Sharon Chun, Court Clerk
Richard Kangas, Reporter/RecorderPARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
007521 Smith, Sarah A.
0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PRO SE Pro SeY
Y
Y
YDeft was not transported for this matter. COURT STATED that Deft's Motion
did not state what transcript date he was requesting, and the motion was not
cognizable. COURT ORDERED, MOTION DENIED.

CLERK'S NOTE: The above minute order has been Distributed to:

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA

vs Budd, Glenford A

CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 018

Glenford Budd, NDOC #90043, Ely State Prison, P.O. Box 1989, Ely, NV
89301

08/27/07 08:15 AM 00 DEFT'S PRO PER MTN FOR REHEARING /45

HEARD BY: David Barker, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Sharon Chun, Court Clerk
Richard Kangas, Reporter/RecorderPARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
009089 Krusey, Amanda K.
0001 D1 Budd, Glenford A
PRO SE Pro Se

Y

Y

N

Y

COURT NOTED that Deft Budd is requesting missing pages from the trial transcript. There being no written opposition by the State, COURT ORDERED, MOTION GRANTED and REQUESTED the State to COPY PAGES 1398-1464 of the Trial Transcript and forward to Deft Budd. Ms. Krusey confirmed she will arrange for that. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, the BALANCE OF THE MOTION IS DENIED.

NDC

CLERK'S NOTE: The above minute order has been Distributed to:
Glenford A. Budd #90043, Ely State Prison, P.O. Box 1989, Ely, NV 89301

11/28/07 08:15 AM 00 PTN FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS /46

HEARD BY: David Barker, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Sharon Chun, Court Clerk
Richard Kangas, Reporter/RecorderPARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
003202 Stanton, David L.

Y

Y

COURT NOTED this is a pro per motion and Deft Budd is incarcerated at the Nevada Department of Corrections. Mr. Stanton provided a copy of the State's Response to the Court for review since it had not yet been received. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED to Friday.

NDC

CONTINUED TO: 11/30/07 08:15 AM 01

CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES

03-C-193182-C STATE OF NEVADA vs Budd, Glenford A
CONTINUED FROM PAGE: 019

11/30/07 08:15 AM 01 PTN FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS /46

HEARD BY: David Barker, Judge; Dept. 18

OFFICERS: Sharon Chun, Court Clerk
Richard Kangas, Reporter/Recorder

PARTIES: STATE OF NEVADA
009089 Krusey, Amanda K.

Y
Y

COURT NOTED that Deft Budd is incarcerated at NDC and has filed a Petition in Proper Person for Writ of Habeas Corpus. COURT READ EACH CLAIM FOR RELIEF and stated its findings for each.

COURT ORDERED, PETITION DENIED, stating its findings. COURT DIRECTED the State to prepare the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the Court's signature.

01/25/08

E X H I B I T S

9:03 AM

CASE NO. 03-C-193182-C

CASE STATUS: CLOSED

STATE OF NEVADA

[] vs Budd, Glenford A

[]

<u>NO.</u>	<u>CODE</u>	<u>EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SUB</u>	<u>OF/OB</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>S</u>
0001	P	/JUSTICE COURT	S	/	06/26/03	V

Certification of Copy

State of Nevada } **SS:**
County of Clark }

I, Charles J. Short, the duly elected, qualifying and acting Clerk of Clark County, in the State of Nevada, and Ex-Officio Clerk of the District Court, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of the original.

NOTICE OF APPEAL; CASE APPEAL STATEMENT; DISTRICT COURT
DOCKET ENTRIES; FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER; NOTICE OF
ENTRY OF DECISION AND ORDER; DISTRICT COURT MINUTES; EXHIBITS LIST

STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff(s),

VS.

GLENFORD BUDD,

Defendant(s),


Case No: C193182

Dept N^o: XVIII

now on file and of record in this office.

**IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto
Set my hand and Affixed the seal of the
Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada
This 25 day of January 2008.**

Charles J. Short, Clark County Clerk


Heather Lofquist, Deputy Clerk

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
OFFICE OF THE CLERK**

GLENFORD ANTHONY BUDD,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

Supreme Court No. 50972
District Court Case No. C193182

RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS

TO: Glenford Anthony Budd #90043
Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney David J. Roger
Charles J. Short , District Court Clerk

You are hereby notified that the Clerk of the Supreme Court has received and/or filed the following:

01/28/08	Voluntary recusal of Justice Saitta from participation in this matter. Sat in district court proceedings.
01/28/08	Filing Fee Waived: Criminal.
01/28/08	Filed Certified Copy of proper person Notice of Appeal. Appeal docketed in the Supreme Court this day.

DATE: January 28, 2008

Tracie Lindeman, Clerk of Court

By: _____

NH
Deputy Clerk