SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRENDAN DUNCKLEY,

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA, and JACK PALMER, Warden,

Respondents.

Case No. 59958

APPELLANT BRENDAN DUNCKLEY'S OPENING BRIEF

Appeal from Denial of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus
Second Judicial District

Robert W. Story
Story Law Group
2450 Vassar Street, Suite 3B
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 284-5510

Attorneys for Appellant Brendan Dunckley

Terrance P. McCarthy
Deputy District Attorney
Post Office Box 30083
Reno, Nevada 89520—3083
(775)328-3294

Attorneys for Respondent The State of Nevada and Jack Palmer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Rules Page

I. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

On June 3, 2011, the District Court conducted an evidentiary hearing. (AA 226-346.) On December 29, 2011, the District Court entered its Order Denying Motion to Withdraw Guilty Pleas and Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment. (AA 353-367.) On December 30, 2011, Mr. Dunckely timely filed his Notice of Appeal. (AA 348-368.) Pursuant to NRS 34.575(1), this Court has jurisdiction over Mr. Dunckely's appeals.

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES

Whether The District Court Erred In Failing To Find That The State Breached The Plea Bargain.

Whether The District Court Erred In Failing To Find That Mr. Dunckley Received Ineffective Assistance Of Counsel Because His Defense Attorney (1) Failed To Conduct An Investigation Into His Alibi Defense, (2) Failed To Interview The Victims, And (3) Failed To Provide Mr. Dunckely With The DNA Results Until After Sentencing.

Whether The District Court Erred In Denying Probation to Mr. Dunckely Through An Ex Post Facto Application Of NRS 176A.110.

III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On July 12, 2007, the State filed in The Second Judicial District Court an Information against Mr. Dunckley charging him with Count I Sexual Assault on a Child, Count II Lewdness With a Child Under the Age of Fourteen Years, Count III Statutory Sexual Seduction, and Count IV Sexual Assault. (AA 1-4.) On February 28, 2008, the State filed against Mr. Dunckley in the District Court

an Amended Information charging with Count I Lewdness with a Child Under the Age of Fourteen Years and Count II Attempted Sexual Assault. (AA 5-8.)

On March 6, 2008, Mr. Dunckley pleaded guilty to both counts in the Amended Information, pursuant to a Guilty Plea Memorandum. (AA 16-31.) District Judge Connie J. Steinheimer accepted Mr. Dunckley's guilty pleas and set sentencing for August 5, 2008, sufficient time to allow Mr. Dunckley the opportunity to attend counseling sessions so that he would be able to show he was a likely candidate for probation. *Id.*

On August 11, 2008, the District Judge entered Judgment against Mr. Dunckley as follows: Count I, Lewdness with a Child Under the Age of Fourteen, NRS 200.230 – imprisonment in the Nevada Department of Prisons for the maximum term of Life with the minimum parole eligibility of 10 years; Count II, Attempted Sexual Assault, NRS 193.330 and NRS 200.366 – imprisonment in the Nevada Department of Prisons for the maximum term of One Hundred Twenty Months with the minimum parole eligibility of 24 months for Count II to be served concurrently with sentence imposed in Count I with credit for four days' time served. (AA 32-33.)

Mr. Dunckely timely appealed the judgment. (AA 90-93.) On May 8, 2009, the Nevada Supreme Court entered an Order of Affirmance of the Judgment. *Id.*

On July 21, 2009, Mr. Dunckley filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post Conviction). (AA 94-170.) On March 3, 2010, Mr. Dunckely filed a Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea. (AA 187-201.) On March 23, 2010, Mr. Dunckely filed a Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. (AA 219-225.) On June 3, 2011, the District Court conducted oral argument on the Motion to Withdraw Guilty Plea and an evidentiary hearing on the Petition and Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. (AA 226-346.) On December 29, 2011, the District Court entered its Order Denying Motion to Withdraw Guilty Pleas and Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment. (AA 353-367.)

On December 30, 2011, Mr. Dunckely filed his Notices of Appeal. (AA 348-368.)

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

By April 16, 2007, the State had charged Mr. Dunckley with four sex crimes which carried life sentences and three of which were alleged to have occurred seven to nine years earlier. (AA 1-4.) At the same time, the rape and murder of Brianna Denison had received a great deal of notoriety in Reno because her body had just been found. (AA 262 & 318.) On May 7, 2007 Reno Justice Court appointed David O'Mara from the Jack Alain conflict group to represent Mr. Dunckley. (AA 320.) At the time of his appointment, Mr. O'Mara

had only handled "three to four sex cases." (AA 293.) Mr. O'Mara was paid a "flat fee" of $500.00 by the Jack Alain group for the legal work he was appointed to do for Mr. Dunckley. (AA 293 & 320.) Accordingly, Mr. O'Mara was to be paid the same $500.00 whether he worked one hour or 1,000 hours on Mr. Dunckley's case. (AA 319-320.) Mr. O'Mara had the authority to hire an investigator, but even with his client facing multiple life sentences, Mr. O'Mara neglected to do so. (AA 320.) In addition, Mr. O'Mara, by his own admission, failed to even interview the victims, two of whom were alleged to have been less than 14 years old at the time of the alleged crimes. *Id.*

On their very first meeting, Mr. Dunckley informed Mr. O'Mara that he had not committed the alleged crimes. (AA-253.) In addition, Mr. Dunckley provided Mr. O'Mara with documentation of the fact that Mr. Dunckley was not even in the State of Nevada at the time most of the crimes allegedly occurred. (AA 252-254.) Mr. Dunckley provided Mr. O'Mara with divorce documentation, showing him to be in California. *Id.* Mr. Dunckley provided Mr. O'Mara with car registration documentation, showing that he did not even own the automobile that one of the crimes was alleged to have occurred in until after the alleged crime occurred. *Id.* If the alleged crime were to have occurred in Mr. Dunckley's automobile, the documentation demonstrated that the alleged victim was over the age of 14 at the time of the crime, and the statute of

limitations had long ago run. (AA 255-256.) Mr. Dunckley provided tax documentation, showing he lived in another state at the time of some of the alleged crimes. (AA 254.) Finally, Mr. Dunckley provided Mr. O'Mara with school transcripts, showing Mr. Dunckley to be living in New York State at the time of some of the alleged crimes. (AA-101.) Mr. Dunckley then asked Mr. O'Mara to conduct an investigation into his alibi evidence. (AA-253.)

One of the crimes charged that Mr. Dunckley forced one of the alleged victims to perform oral sex on him. (AA 3.) The victim of that alleged crime had a blood-alcohol content of .226% at the time of the alleged crime. (AA 67.) The victim claimed she bit Mr. Dunckley's penis forcefully four times. (AA 67 & 281.) Yet, an examination of Mr. Dunckley's penis immediately after the alleged crime showed no bit marks; and a DNA test of Mr. Dunckley's penis taken immediately after the alleged crime showed no DNA from the alleged victim. *Id.* Unfortunately for Mr. Dunckley, although Mr. O'Mara claims he did, Mr. O'Mara failed to share the DNA results with Mr. Dunckely until after Mr. Dunckely had pleaded guilty and had been sentenced. (AA 256 & 297.)

Mr. Dunckely had an alibi defense to the three older sex crimes because he was not even in the State at the time they had allegedly been committed. (AA 252-254.) In addition, the charge by the alleged victim of the forced oral sex was without merit – she had a .226% BA at the time and her allegations of

forceful bites and oral sex were contradicted by lack of bite marks and lack of her DNA. (AA 67 & 281.) Indeed, Mr. Dunckely testified that had he seen the DNA report before he pleaded to this crime, he would not have pleaded. (AA 257-258.) Mr. O'Mara had the DNA report on February 7, 2008, but Mr. Dunckely did not plead guilty to this crime until March 6, 2008. (AA 258-259.)

On February 28, 2008, the State filed against Mr. Dunckley in the District Court an Amended Information charging him with Count I Lewdness with a Child Under the Age of Fourteen Years and Count II Attempted Sexual Assault. (AA 5-8.)

On March 6, 2008, Mr. Dunckley pleaded guilty to both counts in the Amended Information. (AA 16-31.) The District Court accepted Mr. Dunckley's guilty pleas. *Id.* Both Mr. O'Mara and the State informed the District Court as follows:

> **Mr. O'Mara**: Your honor, there's been negotiations with the district attorney's office to set this out five to six months so that Mr. Dunckley can get sexual offender therapy during that period of time. And basically the D.A. is giving him every opportunity to try to qualify for probation and to do the things that will be beneficial for him to present to you at sentencing. So she's allowed for a five- to six-month extension so that he can get those type of therapy classes, and so we'd ask for that type of time before sentencing.
>
> **Ms. Viloria**: Your Honor, my agreement is just to see if this defendant is worthy of any type of grant of probation, whether he can earn it or not. I want to see what he does between now and then.

> So I do not object to any type of continuance that Mr. O'Mara is asking for to set out the sentencing date.

(AA-27-28.) The District Court set sentencing for August 5, 2008, sufficient time to allow Mr. Dunckley the opportunity to attend counseling sessions so that he would be able to show he was a likely candidate for probation. (AA 29.)

Mr. Dunckely complied in all respects with his end of the plea agreement – he attended all counseling sessions and obtained the Psychosexual Evaluation/Risk Assessment which found that Mr. Dunckely "DOES NOT REPRESENT A HIGH RISK TO REOFFEND SEXUALLY...." (AA 75-89; *capitalization in original* at p. 85.) Moreover, during the many months that he was on bail, Mr. Dunckely complied with all conditions of his bail and followed the law. (AA 33-89.)

Despite her placing her agreement on the record that

> Your Honor, my agreement is just to see if this defendant is worthy of any type of grant of probation, whether he can earn it or not. I want to see what he does between now and then.

and despite the fact that Mr. Dunckely had complied in all respects with the plea agreement, the conditions of his bail, and all laws, Ms. Viloria vigorously, inappropriately, and in violation of the spirit of the Guilty Plea Memorandum argued for a prison sentence that exceeded even the recommendation of the Division of Parole and Probation. (AA 44-51.) The District Court accepted Ms. Viloria's arguments and sentenced Mr. Dunckely to imprisonment in the

Nevada Department of Prisons for Life with the minimum parole eligibility of 10 years and a concurrent 120 to 24 months.

V. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The State deprived Mr. Dunckely of both due process and equal protection under the law when the State extracted an illusory Guilty Plea Memorandum from him which held out the hope of probation, and then argued in bad faith against probation after Mr. Dunckely had complied in all respects with the Guilty Plea Memorandum, the conditions of bail, and all laws.

Mr. Dunckley Received Ineffective Assistance Of Counsel Because His Defense Attorney (1) Failed To Conduct An Investigation Into His Alibi Defense, (2) Failed To Interview The Victims, And (3) Failed To Provide Mr. Dunckely With The DNA Results Until After Sentencing.

The District Court Denied Probation to Mr. Dunckely Through An Ex Post Facto Application Of NRS 176A.110.

VI. ARGUMENT

A. The State Breached The Plea Bargain.

1. Standard of Review:

This Court holds the State in a plea agreement to "the most meticulous standards of both promise and performance." *Van Buskirk v. State,* 102 Nev.

241, 243, 720 P.2[d] 1215, 1216 (1986) (citation omitted). The violation of the terms or the spirit of the plea bargain requires reversal. *Id.*

2. Argument:

The State knowingly and intentionally offered Mr. Dunckley an illusory Guilty Plea Memorandum which required Mr. Dunckley to spend months obtaining a psychosexual evaluation in accordance with NRS 176.139. Indeed, during the guilty plea hearing counsel for both the defense and the State informed the District Court as follows:

> **Mr. O'Mara**: Your honor, there's been negotiations with the district attorney's office to set this out five to six months so that Mr. Dunckley can get sexual offender therapy during that period of time. And basically the D.A. is giving him every opportunity to try to qualify for probation and to do the things that will be beneficial for him to present to you at sentencing. So she's allowed for a five- to six-month extension so that he can get those type of therapy classes, and so we'd ask for that type of time before sentencing.
>
> **Ms. Viloria**:Your Honor, my agreement is just to see if this defendant is worthy of any type of grant of probation, whether he can earn it or not. I want to see what he does between now and then.
>
> So I do not object to any type of continuance that Mr. O'Mara is asking for to set out the sentencing date.

(AA-27-28; *underlining added.*)

Mr. Dunckley complied in all respects with the terms of the Guilty Plea Memorandum – Mr. Dunckley attended all required classes and appointments and obtained the appropriate psychosexual evaluation in accordance with NRS

176.139 that would have allowed him probation. (AA-75-89.) Moreover, Mr. Dunckely complied in all respects with the conditions of his bail and complied with all laws. (AA 33-89.)

Yet the State deprived Mr. Dunckely of the benefit of his bargain. The State vigorously, inappropriately, and in violation of the Guilty Plea Memorandum argued for a prison sentence that exceeded even the recommendation of the Division of Parole and Probation. The State used charges it could not prove during a time of heightened anxiety because of the Brianna Dennison rape and murder investigation to con an inexperienced, ineffective, and inadequately paid attorney with a plea offer the State had no intention of fulfilling. The State offered Mr. Dunckley a Guilty Plea Memorandum which allowed him an opportunity of probation. Indeed, the State expressly stated on the record as an officer of the court:

> **Ms. Viloria**: Your Honor, my agreement is just to see if this defendant is worthy of any type of grant of probation, whether he can earn it or not. I want to see what he does between now and then.

(AA- 28.) However, the State deprived Mr. Dunckley of the benefit of probation by acting in bad faith thereby depriving Mr. Dunckley of the sole benefit to him of the Guilty Plea Memorandum. The State had no intention of allowing Mr. Dunckley probation and proved its intention to deprive Mr. Dunckley of the benefit of his bargain through its inappropriate sentencing

arguments. Mr. Dunckely's conduct for the entire time he was on bail was exemplary – he complied in all respects with the guilty plea memorandum, the conditions of his bail and all laws. Despite her representations to the District Court that "I want to see what he does between now and then," Ms. Viloria vigorously argued, not only for no probation, but argued for a sentence well in excess of that recommended by the Division of Parole and Probation in the Presentence Investigation Report. A plea agreement includes an implied obligation of good faith and fair dealing. *U.S. v. Jones,* 58 F.3^{d} 688 (D.C. Cir. 1995); and the State breached the Guilty Plea Memorandum by acting in bad faith. Notwithstanding the State's bad faith, once a defendant enters a guilty plea and the plea is accepted by the court, due process requires that the plea bargain be honored. *Santobello v. New York*, 404 U.S. 257 (1971).

As this Court held in *Citti v. State*, 107 Nev. 89, 91, 807 P.2^{d} 724, 726 (1991) (*quoting Van Buskirk v. State*, 102 Nev. 241, 243, 720 P.2^{d} 1215, 1216 (1986)).

> When the State enters a plea agreement, it "is held to 'the most meticulous standards of both promise and performance.' ... The violation of the terms or 'the spirit' of the plea bargain requires reversal."

The Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment mandate that a guilty plea be knowingly and intelligently entered. *Smith v. O'Grady,* 312 U.S. 329, 334 (1941); *accord, Bryant v. Smith,* 102 Nev.

268, 272, 721 P.2d 364, 368 (1986), *limited on other grounds by Smith v. State,* 110 Nev. 1009, 879 P.2d 60 (1994).

Mr. Dunckley was deprived of both due process and equal protection under the law because the State extracted an illusory Guilty Plea Memorandum from him which held out the hope of probation, and then argued in bad faith against probation. Accordingly, this Court should allow Mr. Dunckely to withdraw his guilty plea.

B. Mr. Dunckley Received Ineffective Assistance Of Counsel Because His Defense Attorney (1) Failed To Conduct An Investigation Into His Alibi Defense, (2) Failed To Interview The Victims, And (3) Failed To Provide Mr. Dunckely With The DNA Results Until After Sentencing.

1. Standard of Review:

This Court evaluates claims of ineffective assistance of counsel under the test established in *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984); *Means v. State*, 120 Nev. 1001, 1012, 103 P.3d 25, 33 (2004).

2. Argument:

The State charged Mr. Dunckley with counts of Sexual Assault on a Child, Lewdness with a Child under the Age of Fourteen Years, Statutory Sexual Seduction, and Sexual Assault. To defend himself, Mr. Dunckley provided his attorney with physical evidence, including school enrollment and attendance documentation and DMV records, divorce records, and IRS records,

to corroborate his alibi that he was not in the State of Nevada at the time some of the crimes were alleged to have occurred and provided his attorney with alibi witnesses that could corroborate his whereabouts. Mr. Dunckley's attorney failed to seek funds to conduct an investigation about the alleged underlying crimes or his alibi defense and failed to interview any witnesses in support of his alibi defense.

In addition, there was no corroborating evidence in support of the alleged crimes of Sexual Assault on a Child, Lewdness with a Child under the Age of Fourteen Years, Statutory Sexual Seduction, and Sexual Assault. In fact, there was a stunning lack of evidence – there was no DNA; there were no bite marks, as the victim alleged; and there were no physical or psychological examinations conducted on any of the victims. Moreover, there was no police report for the lewdness charges, and therefore, a plausible, if not meritorious statute of limitations argument because both women were over 21 years old. To make matters worse, one of the victims had a blood alcohol content of 0.226% at the time of one of the alleged crimes. Finally, some of the crimes were alleged to have occurred years prior to the State bringing charges against Mr. Dunckley. Accordingly, the evidence in support of the alleged crimes consisted of the testimony of the alleged victims; and that testimony was highly suspect, but crucial for a conviction at trial. Mr. Dunckley's attorney failed to independently

interview any of the victims.

In *Warner v. State of Nevada,* 102 Nev. 635, 729 P.2[d] 1359 (1986), this Court held that trial counsel who failed to conduct a pretrial investigation and failed to interview victims in a case involving charges of lewdness with a child under the age of fourteen years and sexual assault denied his client his Sixth Amendment right to the effective assistance of counsel, left his client without a defense, and was so deficient as to render the trial result unreliable – exactly the case here.

Significantly, Mr. O'Mara failed to provide Mr. Dunckely with the DNA results until after Mr. Dunckely had pleaded guilty and had been sentenced. Mr. Dunckely discovered the DNA results in the file he received from Mr. O'Mara while in the Lovelock Correctional Center. (AA 255-256.) In comparing the time Mr. O'Mara received the plea offer from the State and the time Mr. O'Mara received the DNA results from the State, Mr. Dunckely discovered for the first time that Mr. O'Mara received the DNA results after he received the plea offer, but before Mr. Dunckely entered into the Guilty Plea Memorandum. *Id.* Mr. Dunckely believed that the DNA exonerated him from the crimes of sexual assault and attempted sexual assault. *Id.* Had Mr. Dunckely known of the DNA results, Mr. Dunckely would not have entered into the Guilty Plea Memorandum. *Id.*

For his part, Mr. O'Mara does not recall whether or not actually showed the DNA test to Mr. Dunckely, but states that he discussed the DNA results with Mr. Dunckely. (AA 297.) However, Mr. O'Mara is not credible. First, Mr. O'Mara testified that "Mr. Dunckely was moving me towards that position of trial." (AA 298.) If Mr. Dunckely was attempting to persuade Mr. O'Mara to try his case, it makes no sense whatsoever that Mr. Dunckely would decide to plead guilty after receiving evidence that he believed would exonerate him. Second, Mr. O'Mara had every incentive not to try the case – he had little experience in sexual assault cases and he was being paid a flat fee of $500.00. He had already conducted a preliminary hearing and numerous court appearances in this case. Mr. O'Mara had zero incentive to try Mr. Dunckely's case and failed to inform Mr. Dunckely of the DNA results.

Mr. Dunckley's attorney failed to conduct a pretrial investigation into the alleged underlying crimes or into any potential mitigating circumstances or defenses, failed to interview any of the victims whose credibility was crucial for a conviction, and failed to inform Mr. Dunckely of the DNA evidence. Mr. Dunckley's attorney's performance was deficient to the point that he deprived Mr. Dunckley of any defense and provided the District Court and Mr. Dunckley with a completely unreliable outcome and that deficient performance prejudiced Mr. Dunckley. Competent counsel would have sought a court-ordered

investigator, had that investigator explore with his client the facts surrounding the underlying crime and any mitigating circumstances and Mr. Dunckley's alibi defense. Competent counsel would have interviewed the witnesses. After all, that is a requirement that this Court felt so strongly about this Court embodied that requirement into published case law. *Warner, supra.* Finally, competent counsel would have provided Mr. Dunckely with the DNA evidence.

There is no reasonable trial and/or sentencing strategy designed to effectuate Mr. Dunckley's best interest that would have justified his attorney's failures in this regard. Moreover, the independent investigation would have shown Mr. Dunckley's alibi defense was true and that Mr. Dunckley was innocent. The independent investigation and interview of the victims would have also shown that the alleged victims lacked sufficient credibility because of alcohol impairment, age, and/or the length of time between the alleged crime and the trial to support a conviction. Any decision that Mr. Dunckley's attorney may have made not to conduct a pretrial investigation could not have been informed and could not have constituted a reasonable professional judgment. Had Mr. Dunckley's attorney conducted a pretrial investigation and interview of the victims, Mr. Dunckley would not have been convicted of Lewdness with a Child under the Age of Fourteen Years and Attempted Sexual Assault.

Accordingly, this Court should allow Mr. Dunckely to withdraw his

guilty plea.

C. The District Court Denied Probation to Mr. Dunckely Through An Ex Post Facto Application Of NRS 176A.110.

1. Standard of Review:

This Court evaluates claims of improper sentencing by the abuse of discretion standard. *Martinez v. State,* 114 Nev. 735, 961 P.2d 143 (1998)

2. Argument:

During sentencing, District Court made the following statement about Mr. Dunckley's request for probation as provided in his Guilty Plea Memorandum:

> The Court: .... I know you plead to something that allows for a lesser offense, but it does not allow for probation.

(AA 60.) The District Court deprived Mr. Dunckley of the benefit of the Guilty Plea Memorandum through an ex post facto application of NRS 176A.110. According to the terms of the Amended Information, Mr. Dunckley allegedly committed Count I, Lewdness with a Child under the Age of Fourteen Years, a violation of NRS 201.230, "on or between the 14th day of August A.D. A.D., 1998, and the 13th day of August A.D. A.D., 2000, or thereabout...." (AA 5, lines 23 – 25.)

At the time the alleged crime occurred, NRS 176A.110(1) and (3)(j) permitted probation for a person convicted of "Lewdness with a child pursuant

to NRS 201.230." At the time of sentencing, however, the Nevada Legislature had amended NRS 176A.110 to eliminate probation for a person who had committed lewdness with a child pursuant to NRS 201.230. The District Court applied the later version of NRS 176A.110 ex post facto to Mr. Dunckley. The Ex Post Facto Clause of the United States Constitution prohibits laws which make more burdensome the punishment for a crime, after its commission. The Ex Post Facto Clause prohibits, inter alia, laws which "make more burdensome the punishment for a crime, after its commission." *Collins v. Youngblood*, 497 U.S. 37, 52 (1990); *Flemming v. Oregon Board of Parole*, 998 F.2^{d} 721, 723 (9th Cir. 1993). "[T]o fall within the ex post facto prohibition, two critical elements must be present: first, the law 'must be retrospective, that is, it must apply to events occurring before its enactment'; and second, 'it must disadvantage the offender affected by it.'" *Miller v. Florida*, 482 U.S. 423, 430 (1987) (*quoting Weaver v. Graham*, 450 U.S. 24, 29 (1981)).

Mr. Dunckley was deprived of both due process and equal protection under the law and subjected to improperly harsher sentencing because the District Court applied the later version of NRS 176A.110 ex post facto to Mr. Dunckley. Accordingly, this Court should allow Mr. Dunckely to withdraw his guilty plea.

VII. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Dunckley requests this Court to overturn the district court's denial of his request for post-conviction habeas relief and remand with instruction to allow him to withdraw his guilty plea.

VIII. CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.

1. I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface in Word in 14 point times new roman font.

2. I further certify that this brief complies with the page- or type-volume limits of NRAP 32(a)(7) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by NRAP 32(a)(7)(C), it does not exceed 30 pages.

3. Finally I hereby certify that I have read this appellate brief, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I further certify that this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e)(1), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by a reference to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where the matter relied on is to be found. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the

accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

I hereby certify that pursuant to NRS 239B.030, no social security numbers are contained within this document.

DATED: June 25, 2012.

STORY LAW GROUP

By: /s/ Robert W. Story .

ROBERT W. STORY, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 1268
Story Law Group
2450 Vassar Street, Suite 3B
Reno, Nevada 89502
Telephone: (775) 284-5510
Facsimile: (775) 996-4103
Attorneys for Appellant Brendan Dunckley

IX. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on June 25, 2012. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

Terrance P. McCarthy
Deputy District Attorney
Counsel for the State of Nevada.

Attorney General
Catherine Cortez Masto
100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701-4717

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

/s/Barbara A. Ancina
BARBARA A. ANCINA
Story Law Group