1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
2	
3	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
4	Electronically Filed Sep 23 2011 11:04 a.n Tracie K. Lindeman
5	Tracie K. Lindeman  MICHAEL DAMON RIPPO,  Olerk of Supreme Coul
6	) Case No. 53626
7	Appellant,
8	vs.
9	RENEE BAKER, Warden, Ely State
10	Prison, CATHERINE CORTEZ ) MASTO, Attorney General of Nevada, )
11	Respondents.
12	)
13	RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES
14	Appellant Michael Damon Rippo, through undersigned counsel, submits this
15	Response to Notice of Supplemental Authorities. This Response is based upon the following
16	memorandum and all papers and pleadings on file.
17	Dated this 23rd day of September, 2011.
18	Respectfully submitted,
19	RENE VALLADARES
20	Federal Public Defender
21	DAVID ANTHONY
22	Assistant Federal Public Defender 411 East Bonneville Ave., Suite 250
23	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 388-6577
24	Email: David_Anthony@fd.org
25	Counsel for Appellant
26	
27	
28	

## **MEMORANDUM**

On September 20, 2011, the state filed a notice of supplemental authorities pursuant to NRAP 31(e), bringing the cases of <u>Harrington v. Richter</u>, 131 S. Ct. 770 (2011), and <u>Cullen v. Pinholster</u>, 131 S. Ct. 1388 (2011), to this Court's attention. <u>Harrington</u> was issued on January 19, 2011 (over ninth months ago), and <u>Pinholster</u> was issued on April 4, 2011 (over five months ago). The representative for the state has been aware of both cases for over four months, as shown by the answering brief he filed with this Court on May 25, 2011, in <u>Greene v. State</u>, Nev. Sup. Ct. No. 55971, which cites to both cases, yet his supplemental notice of authorities was filed only thirteen days before oral argument in the instant case.

The state asserts that <u>Harrington</u> and <u>Pinholster</u> "clarify the <u>Strickland</u> standard for ineffective assistance of counsel by narrowing the permissible review of counsel's duty to investigate and to employ expert witnesses and by reaffirming the strong presumption that counsel's actions were strategic without need for an evidentiary hearing." Memorandum of Supplemental Authorities at 2.

Harrington and Pinholster do not alter the Strickland standard in any way or narrow the scope of this Court's review of an ineffective assistance of counsel claim as those cases only apply in federal habeas corpus proceedings. Specifically, both cases apply a layer of deference as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) when a federal court reviews the decision of a state court. However, in the instant case, those precedents have no application because this Court is not a federal court reviewing the decision of a state court, and the considerations of comity and federalism underpinning section 2254(d) have no relevance whatsoever in this matter. Mr. Rippo notes that no state court in the nation has relied upon either Harrington or Pinholster as either altering the relevant Strickland standard of ineffective assistance of counsel or limiting the scope of review of such a claim. This Court is therefore obligated to review Mr. Rippo's claims de novo using the Strickland standard and it is not permitted to

apply the levels of deference discussed in Harrington and Pinholster as they are based entirely on the federal habeas corpus statute. DATED this 23rd day of September, 2011. David Anthony Assistant Federal Public Defender Nevada Bar No. 007978 david anthony@fd.org 411 E. Bonneville Ave., Suite 250 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 388-6577 Attorneys for Appellant 

## **CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE** I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on the 23rd day of September, 2011. Electronic Service of the foregoing RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows: Steven Owens, Deputy District Attorney Katrina Manzi, An Employee of the Federal Public Defender