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## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DALE EDWARD FLANAGAN,
Petitioner-Appellant,
v .
THE STATE OF NEVADA and JACK PALMER, Warden, Northern Nevada Correctional Center,

Respondents-Appellees.


#### Abstract

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF

COMES NOW, Petitioner-Appellant DALE EDWARDFLANAGAN, by and through his counsel of record CAL J. POTTER, III., ESQ., and requests an extension of forty-five (45) days up to and including Monday, August 18, 2014, within which to file his Reply Brief, which currently is due on Thursday, July 3, 2014.


Appellant brings this motion pursuant to NRAP 26(b), 27(b), and 31(b)(3). This is Appellant's first request for an extension. This request is based on the papers and pleadings filed herein, the points and authorities submitted herewith, and the following Affidavit of Michael Laurence, Esq.

DATED this $2^{\text {nd }}$ day of July, 2014.

POTTER LAW OFFICES

By /s/ Cal J. Potter, III, Esq.
CAL J. POTTER, III, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 1988
1125 Shadow Lane
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
MICHAEL LAURENCE, ESQ.
California Bar No. 121854
303 Second Street
Suite 400 South Tower
San Francisco, CA 94107
Attorneys for Petitioner-Appellant

## AFFIDAVIT OF MICHAEL LAURENCE, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO $\{$ ss.
MICHAEL LAURENCE, ESQ., being first duly sworn upon oath, deposes and states:

1. Your Affiant is the attorney of record on behalf of the Petitioner-Appellant in this matter, and as such, your Affiant is competent to testify as to the matters set forth herein;
2. That your Affiant is an attorney admitted to practice in the State of California and was permitted to practice pro hac vice before the District Court for Clark County as counsel for Petitioner-Appellant;
3. That your Affiant currently is employed as the Executive Director of the Habeas Corpus Resource Center, an agency in the Judicial Branch of the State of California that represents indigent men and women under sentence of death in state and federal habeas corpus proceedings and in executive clemency proceedings;
4. That your Affiant's appearance in this matter, however, is conducted solely in my capacity as a private attorney and on my own time. As such, it is not part of my responsibilities at the Habeas Corpus Resource Center and is without the use of any state or other institutional resources;
5. That on July 26, 2013, a Notice of Appeal on behalf of the PetitionerAppellant was filed in this matter;
6. That on February 19, 2014, Appellant's Opening Brief was filed in this matter;
7. That Respondent filed two motions for an extension of time to file Respondent's Answering Brief, requesting a total of ninety (90) additional days. This Court granted the requested extensions;
8. That, on June 20, 2014, Respondent's Answering Brief was filed, accompanied
by a 196-page Appendix;
9. That Appellant's Reply Brief currently is due on July 3, 2014;
10. That your Affiant is responsible for drafting the Reply Brief on behalf of Petitioner-Appellant;
11. That your Affiant is unable to complete the Reply Brief in this matter because Respondent's Answering Brief raises substantial factual and legal issues requiring additional review of the extensive record in this matter and because of my responsibilities as the Executive Director of my office and as the supervisor on nineteen capital cases pending before state and federal courts. Your Affiant has been required to draft and file briefing in Jones v. Chappell, Case No. CV-90-2158 (C.D. Cal.), on July 3, 2014, and to complete extensive briefing on all the claims raised in In re Hajek, California Supreme Court Case No. S204529, by July 28, 2014. In addition, your Affiant is required to be out of the state to teach at a death penalty conference from July 16 through July 20, 2014, and to travel to Los Angeles to argue the merits of significant constitutional issues in a capital habeas corpus proceeding in the federal district court on August 4, 2014;
12. That granting an extension will not unnecessarily delay the prompt adjudication of this matter because this appeal raises similar legal issues that this Court will address in Brown v. McDaniel, Case No. 60065, in which this Court has conducted oral argument and submitted the matter for decision on January 6, 2014;
13. That, for the reasons stated above, your Affiant is requesting an additional forty-five (45) days in which to file the Reply Brief in this matter up to and including Monday, August 18, 2014;
14. That, if granted this extension, your Affiant believes the Reply Brief will be filed on or before Monday, August 18, 2014, and no further requests for extension will be required;
15. That your Affiant files this enlargement of time in good faith and not for the purposes of delay.
Further Affiant Sayeth Naught.

$$
\frac{7 n v e r i a l l}{L_{a}}
$$

SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me this $2^{\text {nd }}$ day of July, 2014.


## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. <br> FACTS

Petitioner-Appellant's Reply Brief currently is due on July 3, 2014. Michael Laurence, Esq., is responsible for drafting the Reply Brief. ${ }^{1}$

Counsel requests an extension of forty-five (45) days in which to file the Reply Brief in this matter up to and including Monday, August 18, 2014. This extension is requested because counsel for Petitioner-Appellant has had significant commitments, including his responsibilities as the Executive Director of the Habeas Corpus Resource Center and as the supervisor on nineteen capital cases. The additional time is necessary because counsel has been working on, and will be required to complete briefing in Jones v. Chappell, Case No. CV-90-2158 (C.D. Cal.), which is due on July 3, 2014, and extensive briefing on all the claims raised in In re Hajek, California Supreme Court Case No. S204529, which is due on July 28, 2014. Counsel also is required to be out of the state to teach at a death penalty conference from July 16 through July 20, 2014, and to travel to Los Angeles to argue the merits of a significant constitutional in a capital habeas corpus proceeding in the federal district court on August 4, 2014. In addition, the factual issues raised in Respondent's Answering Brief require counsel to review the extensive record in the case.

1
On May 7, 2013, the District Court granted the Application of Michael Laurence, Esq. to appear as counsel pro hac vice, in the Petitioner-Appellant's habeas corpus proceedings. Mr. Laurence is the Executive Director of the Habeas Corpus Resource Center, an agency in the Judicial Branch of the State of California that represents indigent men and women under sentence of death in state and federal habeas corpus proceedings and in executive clemency proceedings. Mr. Laurence's appearance in this matter, however, is conducted solely in his capacity as a private attorney and on his own personal time.

This request for an additional forty-five (45) days in which to file the Reply Brief up to and including Monday, August 18, 2014, is made in good faith and not for the purposes of delay. Moreover, granting an extension will not unnecessarily delay the prompt adjudication of this matter because this appeal raises similar legal issues that this Court will address in Brown v. McDaniel, Case No. 60065, in which this Court has submitted for decision on January 6, 2014.

## II.

## ARGUMENT

NRAP 31(b)(3) governs motions for extension of time and provides as follows:
(3) Motions for Extensions of Time. A motion for extension of time for filing a brief may be made no later than the due date for the brief and must comply with the provisions of this Rule and Rule 27.
(A) Contents of Motion. A motion for extension of time for filing a brief shall include the following:
(I) The date when the brief is due;
(ii) The number of extensions of time previously granted (including a 5-day telephonic extension), and if extensions were granted, the original date when the brief was due;
(iii) Whether any previous requests for extensions of time have been denied or denied in part;
(iv) The reasons or grounds why an extension is necessary; and
(v) The length of the extension requester and the date on which the brief would become due.

## III.

## CONCLUSION

$\qquad$ For the reasons stated, and in accordance with NRAP 31(b)(3), the Appellant respectfully requests an extension of forty-five (45) days to file the Reply Brief through and including Monday, August 18, 2014.

DATED this $2^{\text {nd }}$ day of July, 2014.

## POTTER LAW OFFICES

By /s/ Cal J. Potter, III, Esq.
CAL J. POTTER, III, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 1988
1125 Shadow Lane
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
MICHAEL LAURENCE, ESQ.
California Bar No. 121854
303 Second Street
Suite 400 South Tower
San Francisco, CA 94107
Attorneys for Petitioner-Appellant

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that pursuant to NRAP 25(1)(d) on the $2^{\text {nd }}$ day of July, 2014, I did serve at Las Vegas, Nevada a true and correct copy of MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF, on all parties to this action by:
$\square \quad$ Facsimile
$\square \quad$ U.S. Mail
$\square \quad$ Hand Delivery
X Electronic Service
Addressed as follows:

Steven B. Wolfson
District Attorney
Steven S. Owens
Deputy District Attorney
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
/s/ Jenna Enrico
Employee of POTTER LAW OFFICES

