1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 2 3 ORIGINAL 4 5 ZANE MICHAEL FLOYD, Appellant, 6 CASE NO. 36752 7 v. THE STATE OF NEVADA Respondent. FILED *10* JUL 25 2001 11 MOTION TO ENLARGE TIME 12 13 MORGAN D. HARRIS STEWART L. BELL Clark County Public Defender Nevada Bar No. 001879 309 S. Third St., Ste. 226 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar No. 000477 Clark County Court House 200 South Third Street, Suite 701 Post Office Box 552212 *15* Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 *16* (702)455-4685 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2211 *17* (702) 455-4711 18 FRANKIE SUE DEL PAPA Nevada Attorney General Nevada Bar No. 000192 19 Capitol Complex Carson City, Nevada 89710 20 (702) 486-3420 21 Counsel for Respondent Counsel for Appellant 22 23 24 25 26 JUL 2 5 2001 27 JANETTE M. BLOOM CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

28

DEPUTY CLERK

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
2	
3	
4	
5	ZANE MICHAEL FLOYD,)
6	Appellant,)
7	v.) CASE NO. 36752
8	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
9	Respondent.)
10	
11	
12	MOTION TO ENLARGE TIME
13	COMES NOW, the State of Nevada, by STEWART L. BELL, Clark County
14	District Attorney, through his deputy JAMES TUFTELAND, and moves to enlarge the
15	time within which to file Respondent's Answering Brief up to and including
16	September 17, 2001.
17	This motion is based on the following memorandum, declaration and all papers
18	and pleadings on file herein.
19	Dated this 23rd day of July, 2001.
20	
21	Respectfully submitted,
22	STEWART L. BELL District Attorney
23	
24	Daniel De andered
25	By JAMES TUFTELAND
26	Nevada Bar No. 000439 Chief Deputy
27	Attorney for Respondent

MEMORANDUM

Appellant's Opening Brief was received by the respondent State of Nevada on	
April 30, 2001. The time within which to file Respondent's Answering Brief was	
enlarged pursuant to Supreme Court Order filed May 22, 2001, following Appellant's	
motion for an extension of time and permission to file an opening brief in excess of	
thirty pages. Said answering brief is currently due July 23, 2001.	

A draft of Respondent's Answering Brief has been completed but review of said draft has not been completed and in discussion's with the law clerk who drafted the brief, it appears that some revision and/or additions will be necessary.

NRAP 26(b) allows for enlargement of time upon good cause shown. The appellate section of the district attorneys office has been operating at less than full strength for several months while continuing to work on approximately thirty appeals and over one hundred district court post-conviction matters. There are times when deadlines simply cannot be met.

Based on the foregoing, an enlargement of time of eight weeks within which to file Respondent's Answering Brief is hereby requested, making said brief due on or before September 17, 2001.

Respectfully Submitted,

STEWART L. BELL District Attorney

JAMES TUF JELAND Chief Deputy District Attorney

DECLARATION

I, James Tufteland, am a duly licensed attorney in the State of Nevada and am employed by the Clark County District Attorney's Office.

I assigned the responsibility of drafting Respondent's Answering Brief in the case styled Zane Michael Floyd v. The State of Nevada, No. 36752, to one of the appellate section's law clerks. The appellate section is budgeted for eight law clerks but has been operating with seven for the past three months and is currently down to six. Additionally, four of the clerks are currently studying for the Nevada Bar Exam including the clerk assigned to this appeal.

The work load typically averages about thirty appeals and over one hundred district court post-conviction matters per month. Meeting deadlines on each and every one of these matters is just not humanly possible.

A draft of respondent's brief was received by undersigned counsel first thing Monday morning, July 23, 2001, but review of said draft and discussion's with the law clerk reveal that some revision and perhaps additions to said draft are necessary before said brief will be acceptable for filing. This is an appeal of a capital conviction with a fourteen volume appendix. Due to the extent of the record and the importance of the issues an enlargement of time of eight weeks from the current due date will likely be necessary to make those changes and file said brief.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Lynn Robinson has spoken with counsel for Appellant, Robert L. Miller, and he has agreed to allow the State the additional time it requests.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 23rd day of July, 2001.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar No. 000439

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify and affirm that I mailed a copy of the foregoing Motion to Enlarge Time to File Respondent's Answering Brief to the attorney of record listed below on July 23, 2001.

MORGAN HARRIS Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

> Employee Clark County District Attorney's Office

TUFTELAND/David Schubert/enlish



STEWART L. BELL

District Attorney

J. CHARLES THOMPSON Assistant District Attorney

JOHNNIE B. RAWLINSON Assistant District Attorney

JAMES TUFTELAND Chief Deputy OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

POST-CONVICTION PROCESSES

Clark County Courthouse • 200 S Third St 4th FI • PO Box 552212 • Las Vegas NV 89155-2212 (702) 455-4843 • Fax: (702) 383-8465

July 23, 2001

The Honorable Janette Bloom Clerk of the Supreme Court Office of the Clerk State of Nevada Capitol Complex Carson City, Nevada 89710

Re: Zane Michael Floyd,

State of Nevada

No.36752

Dear Ms. Bloom:

JUL 25 2001

JAMETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERY

We are enclosing the original and one copy of our Motion for Enlargement of Time in the above-captioned case for filing in your office and consideration by the Court

Very truly yours,

STEWART L. BELL District Attorney

James Tufteland

Chief Deputy

Tufteland/Schubert/english Encl