IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 1 2 KIRSTIN BLAISE LOBATO, Case No.: 3 Petitioner. 4 **Electronically Filed** VS. Aug 26 2011 09:38 a.m. 5 Tracie K. Lindeman STATE OF NEVADA. Clerk of Supreme Court 6 7 Respondents. 8 MOTION FOR STAY OF FAST TRACK RULES 9 COMES NOW Petitioner, Kirsten Blaise Lobato, by and through her pro bono counsel, 10 11 Travis N. Barrick, Esq., and hereby requests that this Honorable Court exercise its discretion 12 and stay the Fast Track Rules pending its decision on the Motion to Waive Application of 13 NRAP 3C. This Motion is based upon NRAP 27, the papers and pleadings on file herein and the 14 Points and Authorities below. 15 DATED this 26 day of August, 2011. 16 17 By: 18 Travis N. Barrick, SBN 9257 19 Gallian Wilcox Welker Olson & Beckstrom, LC 540 E St. Louis Avenue 20 Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 (702) 892-3500 21 Facsimile: (702) 386-1946 22 tbarrick@gwwo.com Pro bono counsel for Petitioner 23 24 **POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

I. BACKGROUND FACTS.

25

26

27

28

Petitioner, Kirstin Blaise Lobato was convicted of Count I - Voluntary Manslaughter with use of a Deadly Weapon and Count 2 - Sexual Penetration of a Dead Human Body. Ms. Lobato's case was a complicated, high profile trial lasting almost a full month that was

Lobato's case was a complicated, high profile trial lasting almost a full month that was broadcast live nationally by Court TV. It presented novel pre-trial as well as post-trial legal issues; and numerous appealable issues arose during trial as well.

Ms. Lobato was sentenced as follows: Count 1 - 48 months to 120 months plus an equal and consecutive 48 months to 120 months; and Count 2 - 60 months to 180 months (Count 2 to run concurrent with Count 1). The Court granted 1,544 days credit time served.

Ms. Lobato's direct appeal (No. 49087) was exempted from the Fast Track Rules due to the complexity of the case and nature of the charges. A copy of the previous Order is attached hereto.

Subsequently, Ms. Lobato filed a 770-page Petition for a Writ of *Habeas Corpus* that includes 79 grounds for relief supported by 101 exhibits, and her 205-page Answer to the State's Response is supported by an additional 5 exhibits. The District Court's FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER summarily denying Ms. Lobato's Petition raises a plethora of substantive legal and factual issues for appeal by Ms. Lobato.

On August 1, 2011, Ms. Lobato's Notice of Appeal of the District Court's Order was filed with the Court.

On August 2, 2100, Ms. Lobato's Appeal was docketed and notice that the Appeal was to proceed under the Fast Track Rules was served upon Ms. Lobato's counsel.

On August 25, 2011, Ms. Lobato filed with the Court a Motion for Waiver of Application of NRAP 3C and Request for Full Briefing.

II. ARGUMENT.

NRAP 27(a)(2) provides as follows:

A motion must state with particularity the grounds for the motion, the relief sought, and the legal argument necessary to support it. The motion shall contain or be accompanied by any matter required by a specific provision of these Rules

governing such a motion. If a motion is supported by affidavits or other papers, they shall be served and filed with the motion.

A. GROUNDS.

Ms. Lobato's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus includes 79 grounds for relief supported by 101 exhibits, and her 205-page Answer to the State's Response is supported by an additional 5 exhibits. The District Court's FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER summarily denying Ms. Lobato's Petition raises a plethora of substantive legal and factual issues for appeal by Ms. Lobato. Treatment under the Fast track Rules with a 10 page limit would be unduly restrictive and burdensome in this particular case. The 10 page limitation could not provide this Court with sufficient information to adequately review the record.

B. RELIEF SOUGHT.

Ms. Lobato seeks a Stay of the Fast Track Rules pending the Court's decision on her Motion for Waiver of Application of NRAP 3C and Request for Full Briefing.

C. ARGUMENT.

In *Woods v. State*, the Nevada Supreme Court held that the Fast Track Rules under NRAP 3C, including the restrictions on the briefing, "complies with the due process requirements of the United States Constitution, the Nevada Constitution and NRS 2.120." ¹

In *Hernandez v. State*, the Nevada Supreme Court subsequently upheld the 10 page limit, but also exercised its discretion in granting the petitioner an exception, and allowed him to file an 80 page brief, "given the seriousness and complexity" of his appeal.²

Here, given the complexity of the issues raised in Ms. Lobato's Appeal, the Court has the discretion to waive the 10 page limit, as requested in Ms. Lobato's Motion for Waiver of Application of NRAP 3C and Request for Full Briefing.

¹ Woods v. State, 115 Nev. 344, 352, 990 P.2d 786 (1999).

² Hernandez v. State, 117 Nev. 463, 468, 24 P.3d 767 (2001).

Ms. Lobato's Motion for Stay will toll the time requirements under the Fast Track Rules until the Court renders its decision on Ms. Lobato's Ms. Lobato's Motion for Waiver of Application of NRAP 3C and Request for Full Briefing.

III. CONCLUSION.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Honorable Supreme Court stay the application of the time requirements of the Fast Track Rules until such time as it renders its decision on Ms. Lobato's Motion for Waiver of Application of NRAP 3C and Request for Full Briefing.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Travis N. Barrick, SBN 9257

Gallian Wilcox Welker Olson & Beckstrom, LC

540 E St. Louis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

(702) 892-3500

Facsimile: (702) 386-1946

tbarrick@gwwo.com

Pro bono counsel for Petitioner