

- 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

Electronically Filed  
Jul 19 2013 09:14 a.m.  
Tracie K. Lindeman  
Clerk of Supreme Court

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**DECLARATION OF NANCY L. LEMCKE**

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada; I am a deputy public defender assigned to represent GUILLERMO RENTERIO-NOVOA in this appeal; I am familiar with the procedural history of this case.

2. A jury convicted Appellant of 36 sex offenses for which he received numerous sentences of Life in the Nevada Department of Prisons.

3. The instant Appendix consists of over 1400 pages. The instant appeal involves numerous complex and, in some cases, constitutionally significant issues. Those issues include, but are not limited to: the propriety of the prosecutor's excusal of minority panelists from the jury venire; the trial court's refusal to allow the defense to present certain evidence critical to the defense theory; the trial court's refusal to suppress Appellant's statement to interrogating detectives; the trial court's refusal to issue a pre-trial ruling precluding use of the term 'victim'; the propriety of certain vagaries in the Information; the admission of bad act evidence; the trial court's refusal to declare a mistrial following the revelation that the complainant received a special visa granted crime victims, and the propriety of a numerous jury instructions.

4. Issues relating to the vagaries in the Information, the sufficiency of the evidence presented at trial, and the propriety of often-given instructions in sex cases required extensive briefing. Matching 36 counts alleging repetitive conduct

1 occurring over a 5 year time frame with the testimony presented at trial proved  
2 exceedingly difficult to analyze and brief with any measure of brevity. Likewise,  
3 attacking as improper jury instructions that have become standard practice in  
4 sexual assault cases involved rather complex and lengthy briefing. And *Batson*  
5 challenges such as that prosecuted here, because of the required analysis,  
6 necessarily involve more extensive briefing. Accordingly, effective prosecution of  
7 these and many of the other claims described above required briefing in excess of  
8 the limit(s) otherwise allowed by this Honorable Court.  
9

10  
11  
12 5. Thus, I am requesting leave to file an Opening Brief in excess of the  
13 limits otherwise allowed by this Honorable Court.  
14

15 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and  
16 correct.  
17

18 EXECUTED on the 18<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2013.  
19

20 /s/ Nancy L. Lemcke  
21 NANCY L. LEMCKE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- 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

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

7  
8

9  
10  
11  
12

14

15

19  
20  
21  
22

- 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

CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO  
STEVEN S. OWENS

NANCY L. LEMCKE  
HOWARD S. BROOKS

GUILLERMO RENTERIO-NOVOA  
NDOC No. 1092343  
c/o High Desert State Prison  
P.O. Box 650  
Indian Springs, NV 89018

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28