

1 ALVERSON, TAYLOR, MORTENSEN & SANDERS
2 DAVID J. MORTENSEN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 002547
3 CANDACE C. HERLING, ESQ.
4 Nevada Bar No. 13503
6605 Grand Montecito Parkway, #200
5 Las Vegas, NV 89149
6 Phone: 702-384-7000
Fax: 702-385-7000
7 E-File: efile@alversontaylor.com
8 Attorneys for RESPONDENT
Michael D. Barnum, M.D.

Electronically Filed
Apr 03 2018 08:14 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

10 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

11 **

12 FRANK MILFORD PECK,
13 Appellant,
14 vs.

Supreme Court No. 68664

15 VALLEY HOSPITAL MEDICAL
16 CENTER; DAVID R. ZIPF, M.D.; AND
17 MICHAEL D. BARNUM, M.D.,
18 Respondents

19 **OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO**
20 **RESEARCH, PERFECT, AND FILE A PETITION FOR REVIEW**
21 **AND MOTION TO DECLARE APPELLANT FRANK PECK A**
22 **VEXATIOUS LITIGANT PURSUANT TO NRAP 40A(g)**

23 Pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellant Procedure (NRAP) 27
24 Respondent, Michael D. Barnum, M.D., by and through his counsel of
25 record, David J. Mortensen, Esq. and Candace C. Herling, Esq. of the law
26 firm ALVERSON, TAYLOR, MORTENSEN & SANDERS, and hereby
27
28

1 presents its Opposition to Appellant Frank Milford Peck's Motion for
2 Enlargement of Time to Research, Perfect, and File a Petition for Review.

3
4 This opposition is made and based upon the attached points and
5 authorities, any oral argument permitted at the time of hearing of this
6 motion, and all the papers and pleadings on file in this matter.
7

8 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

9 **I. APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME IS**
10 **A THINLY VEILED ATTEMPT TO REVIVE AN ACTION**
11 **WHICH THIS COURT HAS ALREADY DECIDED; THUS, IT**
12 **SHOULD BE DENIED**

13 **A. NRAP 3C Does Not Apply to this Matter, as it is not a**
14 **Criminal Appeal**

15 **B. None of Appellant's Arguments Provide any Legal Basis for**
16 **the Enlargement of Time, Making the Motion for a Mere**
17 **Stalling Tactic to Prevent the Close of this Appeal**

18 **II. APPELLANT'S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DOES**
19 **NOT MEET THE STRICT GUIDELINES OF NRAP 40A;**
20 **THUS, APPELLANT SHOULD BE DEEMED A VEXATIOUS**
21 **LITIGANT PURSUANT TO NRAP 40A(g) AND NEVADA**
22 **SUPREME COURT RULE 9.5**

23 **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

24 Appellant Frank Peck (hereinafter referred to as "Appellant" or "Mr.
25 Peck") brought the underlying suit against Respondent Michael Barnum,
26 M.D. (hereinafter referred to as "Respondent" or "Dr. Barnum"), David
27
28

1 Zipf, M.D., and Valley Hospital Medical Center (hereinafter "Valley
2 Hospital") on October 13, 2014, alleging a foreign body had been left in his
3 hand after hospitalization. AA0066-69. The Eighth Judicial District Court
4 granted a Judgment on the Pleadings in favor of Respondent on August 6,
5 2015 for failure to attach a required affidavit of merit pursuant to NRS
6 41A.071. AA0076 – 81. Appellant filed his Notice of Appeal on August
7 17, 2015. AA0082. Appellant requested, and was granted, pro bono
8 representation for his appeal. Rachel E. Donn, Esq. and Andrea M.
9 Gandara, Esq. of Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Wray, Puzey & Thompson
10 provided legal representation to Appellant. See Order dated December 7,
11 2015, on file herein.

12 On September 8, 2016, Appellant stipulated to the dismissal of Valley
13 Hospital. See Stipulation and Order to Dismiss Valley Hospital. The
14 remaining parties filed responsive briefing on September 26, 2016. See
15 generally, Respondent Michael D. Barnum M.D.'s Amended Answering
16 Brief, on file herein. Parties presented oral arguments to this Honorable
17 Court on September 26, 2017. Thereafter, this Honorable Court rendered its
18 opinion, upholding the District Court's Judgment on the Pleadings. 133
19 Nev. Adv. Op. 108 (Dec. 28, 2017).

20 ...
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

On February 12, 2018, Appellant's counsel of record filed a Motion to Withdraw, as Appellant's request for a Motion for Reconsideration was beyond the scope of their representation. *See* Motion to Withdraw as Counsel, on file herein. On March 1, 2018, this Honorable Court ordered Appellant file his petition for review within thirty (30) days. *See* Order dated March 1, 2018, on file herein. Appellant filed a Motion for Leave and a Motion for Enlargement of Time on March 22, 2018 (on file herein). In addition to this appeal, Appellant has a long history of Nevada Supreme Court appeals and Eighth Judicial District Court actions. *See* docketing statements, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

LEGAL ARGUMENT

I. APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME IS A THINLY VEILED ATTEMPT TO REVIVE AN ACTION WHICH THIS COURT HAS ALREADY DECIDED; THUS, IT SHOULD BE DENIED

Nevada Rule of Appellant Procedure 40(c)(1) states that "no point may be raised for the first time" in a request for reconsideration. The Rule further states that review, rehearing, and reconsideration are only available when the Court has "overlooked or misapprehended a material fact in the records or a material question of law in the case," or when the Court has "overlooked, misapplied, or failed to consider" relevant statutes, rules, or controlling authority. NRAP 40(c)(2); NRAP 40A(c).

1 Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time does not contain any
2 reference to potential grounds for review, rehearing, or reconsideration that
3 would meet the strict guidelines of NRAP 40 or 40A. Rather, Appellant
4 makes a number of tenuous arguments about information he *might* be able to
5 find if given a seemingly limitless amount of additional time to conduct
6 legal research. (Mot. at 2). These arguments amount to little more than
7 stalling tactics to prevent this Honorable Court from closing the present
8 appeal; thus Respondent requests this Honorable Court deny the present
9 Motion.
10
11

12
13 **A. NRAP Rule 3C Does Not Apply to this Matter, as it is not a**
14 **Criminal Appeal**

15 Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 3C governs fast-tracked criminal
16 appeals. This is not a criminal appeal; it is a civil matter wherein Appellant
17 brought a professional negligence suit against Respondent. Thus, NRAP 3C
18 does not apply; rather, Appellant's appeal is governed by NRAP 3A, which
19 does not provide a mechanism for enlarging time. *See generally*, NRAP 3A.
20
21

22 Not only does NRAP 3C not apply to civil appeals, but the cited
23 section of NRAP, "Rule 3C(h)" has no bearing on enlargement of time in
24 any appeal, as it refers to compensation for Court Reporters in producing
25 transcripts. Furthermore, even if Rule 3C applied to this appeal, which it
26 does not, Appellant's request does not meet any of the guidelines for
27
28

1 enlargement of time, as those extensions only apply to the preparation of
2 transcripts and initial statements of fast-track appeals outlining the errors of
3 the lower court rulings with “extreme need or merit.” *See* NRAP 3C(i):
4 Extensions of Time.
5

6 Given the foregoing, Appellant has not provided any legal grounds to
7 request an extension of time, and the same should be denied by this
8 Honorable Court, as the March 1, 2018 Order indicated no additional time
9 would be granted for the filing of Appellant’s Motion for Reconsideration.
10

11
12 **B. None of Appellant’s Arguments Provide any Legal Basis for**
13 **the Enlargement of Time, Making the Motion for a Mere**
14 **Stalling Tactic to Prevent the Close of this Appeal**

15 Not only has Appellant failed to offer any *procedural reason* an
16 enlargement of time would be appropriate at this stage of his appeal, but he
17 has failed to provide any *legal merit* for his request. Appellant has listed a
18 number of areas he would like to research, given an enlargement of time, as
19 he asserts that research *may result* in a legal argument which allow his
20 appeal to move forward. None of Appellant’s listed areas of inquiry would
21 have any bearing on his request for reconsideration.
22

23
24 Appellant’s primary argument referencing the unavailability of “NRS
25 41A.003 - .120,” (cited in this Honorable Court’s Opinion) appears
26 disingenuous. (Mot. at 2). This Honorable Court’s language is a clear and
27
28

1 unambiguous reference to the entire scope of NRS 41A (41A.003 –
2 41A.120), which Appellant regularly refers to and quotes, and thus has
3 ample access to. *See e.g.*, Motion for Leave at 4, also filed on March 22,
4 2018 (wherein Appellant referenced the language of NRS 41A.100 (1) and
5 argued the “statute stands in the way of itself”). As such, Appellant’s
6 request is moot and does not provide appropriate grounds for further appeal
7 or reconsideration.
8

10 Appellant’s additional requests to research legislative intent and the
11 definition of a “surgical needle” as referenced in *Szydel v. Markman*, (121
12 Nev. 453, 459, 117 P.3d 200, 204 (2005)) are equally moot. This Honorable
13 Court held in its decision that Appellant *did not undergo surgery*, and thus
14 could not avail himself of the exceptions in NRS 41A.100(1), and no other
15 exceptions to the affidavit requirement of NRS 41A.071 applied. *See* 133
16 Nev. Adv. Op. 108, at 6. Thus, there is no relevant legislative intent or
17 applicable case law relating to “non-surgical needles”; an enlargement of
18 time to research the same would be sanctioning the legal equivalent of a wild
19 goose chase. Appellant is aware no additional information exists, as his pro
20 bono counsel likely had ample time to research and prepare his appellate
21 briefs, oral arguments, and supplemental briefing.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Based on the foregoing, Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time
2 provides no legal basis for his request; therefore, it should not be granted
3 and this appeal should be closed.
4

5 **II. APPELLANT'S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DOES**
6 **NOT MEET THE STRICT GUIDELINES OF NRAP 40A;**
7 **THUS, APPELLANT SHOULD BE DEEMED A VEXATIOUS**
8 **LITIGANT PURSUANT TO NRAP 40A(g)**

9 Pursuant to NRAP 40A(a), "*en banc* reconsideration of a decision of a
10 panel of the Supreme Court is not favored and ordinarily *will not be ordered*
11 except when (1) reconsideration by the full court is necessary to secure or
12 maintain uniformity of decisions of the Supreme Court or Court of Appeals,
13 or (2) the proceeding involves a substantial precedential, constitutional or
14 public policy issue" (emphasis added). If the request does not meet the
15 "rigid standards of Rule 40A(a), the duty of counsel is discharged without
16 filing a petition for *en banc* reconsideration of a panel decision. Counsel
17 filing a frivolous petition shall be deemed to have multiplied the proceedings
18 in the case and to have increased costs unreasonably and vexatiously."
19
20
21

22 The Nevada Supreme Court has previously considered whether a
23 proper person litigant can be sanctioned and his court access restricted for
24 actions amounting to harassment and frivolity. In *Jordan v. State*, 121 Nev.
25 44, 56, 110 P.3d 30, 40 (2005), the Court found that under NRCP 11(c)(2),
26 Nevada courts have the authority to impose sanctions on proper person
27
28

litigants “sufficient to deter repetition of a party’s conduct in frivolously or vexatiously pursuing an action.” (abrogated on other grounds by *Buzz Stew, LLC v. City of N. Las Vegas*, 124 Nev. 224, 228, 181 P.3d 670, 672 (2008)). This includes the power to dismiss the claim or action altogether, prohibiting the litigant from filing future actions against a particular party, or barring the litigant from filing any new action without first demonstrating to the court that the proposed case is not frivolous. *See Peck v. Crouser*, 129 Nev. 120, 295 P.3d 586 (2013); NRCP 11(c)(2). (It should be noted that the Nevada Supreme Court’s previous opinion relating to vexatious litigation of *pro se* litigants involves **this same Appellant**). In addition to authority derived from NRAP 40, Nevada courts have inherent powers of equity and control over the exercise of their jurisdiction. *See Matter of Hartford Textile Corp.*, 681 F.2d 895, 897 (2d Cir. 1982) (the equity power of courts to give injunctive relief against vexatious litigation is an ancient one).

Nevada Supreme Court Rule 9.5 contemplates potentially abusive behaviors by vexatious civil litigants and provides a remedy to prevent such conduct. Nevada Supreme Court Rule 9.5 provides as follows:

Rule 9.5. List of vexatious litigants

1. Purpose and procedure. The administrative office of the courts shall maintain for use by the judicial council and the courts of the state a list of litigants that have been declared as vexatious by any court, at any level of jurisdiction,

1 throughout the state:

2 (a) Each court shall, upon entering an order
3 declaring a litigant to be vexatious, submit a copy of the order
4 to the director of the administrative office of courts or his or her
designee.

5 (b) The director or designee shall enter the
6 name of the litigant identified in the aforementioned order on a
7 list of vexatious litigants and post the list in such a place so that
it will be readily accessible to the various courts. The director
or designee shall maintain the list in good order.

8 (c) If a court takes any action that affects
9 the status of a litigant declared vexatious, the court shall
10 forward record of that action to the director or designee
forthwith for amendment of the list.

11 Appellant has proven himself time and again to be a vexatious litigant
12 who abuses the court system to hold his legal adversaries, including this
13 Respondent, hostage in an endless cycle of appeals and reconsiderations to
14 prevent the closing of an appeal. *See Exhibit A.* The present Motions are
15 mere stalling tactics with no underlying legal merit and only serve to further
16 delay the final disposition of this matter. Appellant make no attempt to offer
17 evidence of inconsistent Supreme Court decisions or a “substantial
18 precedential, constitutional or public policy issue” which would support *en*
19 *banc* reconsideration. Instead, Appellant offers vague topics of research
20 which he would like to explore in an effort to find *potential legal arguments*
21 that he may have missed during his initial appeal, essentially beginning his
22 appeal anew.

23
24 Not only are these arguments inappropriate, but they are the very
25
26
27
28

1 definition of unreasonable and vexatious, as contemplated by NRAP 40A(g),
2 as they do not meet this Honorable Court's strict guidelines. Thus,
3
4 Respondent requests this Honorable Court deny Appellant's Motion for
5 Enlargement of Time and enter an order declaring Frank Peck to be a
6 vexatious litigant and submit such order to the administrative office of the
7
8 court, pursuant to Nevada Supreme Court Rule 9.5.

9 ...

10
11 ...

12
13 ...

14
15 ...

16
17 ...

18
19 ...

20
21 ...

22
23 ...

24
25 ...

26
27 ...

28

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Respondent requests that this Honorable Court deny Appellant's Motion for Leave to Refile Petition for Review grant Respondent's Motion deeming Appellant a vexatious litigant pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure and Nevada Supreme Court Rule 9.5, and accordingly sanction Appellant to the fullest extent of the law, including but not limited to restricting Appellant's Court access to further pursue those frivolous claims against this Respondent.

DATED this 2nd day of April, 2018.

ALVERSON, TAYLOR,
MORTENSEN & SANDERS



DAVID J. MORTENSEN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 002547
CANDACE C. HERLING, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 13503

6605 Grand Montecito Parkway, #200
Las Vegas, NV 89149
Phone: 702-384-7000

Attorneys for RESPONDENT

Michael D. Barnum, M.D.

Exhibit A

Civil/Criminal Case Records Search Results

[Skip to Main Content](#) [Logout](#) [My Account](#) [Search Menu](#) [New District](#) [Civil/Criminal Search](#) [Refine Search](#) [Location](#) [District Court](#) [Civil/Criminal](#) [Help](#)

Record Count: 8

Search By: Party **Party Search Mode:** Name **Last Name:** Peck **First Name:** Frank **All All** **Sort By:** Filed Date

| Case Number | Citation Number | Style/Defendant Info | Filed/Location | Type/Status | Charge(s) |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------|
| A-13-677214-C | | Frank Peck, Plaintiff(s) vs. Dwight Nevin, Defendant(s) | 02/25/2013 Department 22 | Other Civil Filing Closed | |
| A-14-697312-C | | Frank Peck, Plaintiff(s) vs. James Cox, Defendant(s) | 03/07/2014 Department 30 | Other Civil Filing Closed | |
| A-14-708447-C | | Frank Peck, Plaintiff(s) vs. Valley Hospital Medical Center, Defendant(s) | 10/13/2014 Department 10 | Malpractice - Medical/Dental Closed | |
| A-14-709060-C | | Frank Peck, Plaintiff(s) vs. Nevada State of, Defendant(s) | 10/28/2014 Department 27 | Negligence - Other Negligence Closed | |
| A-16-743859-C | | Frank Peck, Plaintiff(s) vs. Nevada State of, Defendant(s) | 09/22/2016 Department 30 | Other Civil Matters Open | |
| A-17-759971-W | | Frank Peck, Plaintiff(s) vs. Brian Williams Warden HDSP, Defendant(s) | 08/16/2017 Department 32 | Writ of Habeas Corpus Open | |
| A-17-765984-W | | Frank Peck, Plaintiff(s) vs. Brian Williams, Defendant(s) | 12/08/2017 Department 2 | Writ of Habeas Corpus Open | |
| A-18-769627-W | | Frank Peck, Plaintiff(s) vs. Brian Williams, Defendant(s) | 02/15/2018 Department 1 | Writ of Habeas Corpus Open | |

Appellate Case Management System

© Track and Brown, Inc. 2015. All Rights Reserved.

Find Case...

Cases

Case Search

Participant Search

Disclaimer: The information and documents available here should not be relied upon as an official record of action. Only filed documents can be viewed. Some documents received in a case may not be available for viewing. Some documents originating from a lower court, including records and appendices, may not be available for viewing. For official records, please contact the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Nevada at (775) 684-1600.

Search for Case

Search

Case No.:

Caption Contains:

peck

Exclude Closed:



Clear

Search

51 to 79 of 79 rows are displayed. Previous

Search Results

| ▲ Case No. ▼ | Short Caption | ▲ Filed Date ▼ | ▲ Category ▼ | ▲ Type ▼ | ▲ Subtype ▼ | ▲ Case Status ▼ |
|--------------|---|----------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------------------|---|
| 60343 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 02/29/2012 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post-Conviction/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 60040 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 01/13/2012 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 59775 | PITTMAN (DEASK) VS. BAKER | 12/05/2011 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 59258 | PECK VS. CROUSER | 09/23/2011 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 59014 | DE ROO VS. DIST. CT. (DE ROO) | 08/17/2011 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Mandamus/Prohibition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 57968 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 03/17/2011 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post-Conviction/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 54884 | DARK PEAK DRIVE VS. DEL WEBB COMMUNITIES | 11/05/2009 | Civil Appeal | General | Other | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 54875 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 11/04/2009 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 54168 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 07/14/2009 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Direct | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 53947 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 06/09/2009 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 53826 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 05/19/2009 | Criminal Appeal | Other | Other/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 53639 | PECK (LARRY) VS. DIST. CT. (WASHOE CO. DA'S OFFICE) | 04/20/2009 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 53403 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 03/11/2009 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 52261 | BOYKIN VS. BANNISTER | 08/19/2008 | Civil Appeal | Family Law | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 51948 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 07/01/2008 | Criminal Appeal | Other | Other/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 48694 | RENO A & E VS. DIST. CT. (HUYNH) | 01/05/2007 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Mandamus/Prohibition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur |

Case Search

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|---|
| 47874 | DECKER VS. DISTRICT COURT (ROBERTS) | 08/18/2006 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Mandamus/Prohibition | Issued/Case Closed Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 46160 | PECK (LARRY) VS. DISTRICT COURT | 10/24/2005 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 43402 | CABLE VS. EMPLOYERS INS. CO. OF NEV. | 06/04/2004 | Civil Appeal | General | Other | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 42672 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 01/20/2004 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post-Conviction | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 41904 | PECK (LARRY) VS. STATE | 09/12/2003 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Direct | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 38974 | PECK VS. U.S. BANK OF NEVADA | 12/24/2001 | Civil Appeal | General | Other | Disposition Filed/Case Closed |
| 38835 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 11/27/2001 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post-Conviction | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 38018 | BAILEY (ANTHONY) VS. SGT. BOOK | 06/12/2001 | Civil Appeal | Family Law | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 35626 | DUFF VS. PECK | 02/11/2000 | Civil Appeal | Family Law | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 34929 | GREENE VS. NICKEL | 10/05/1999 | Civil Appeal | Family Law | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 33737 | SPECKERT VS. CEUSAC | 02/10/1999 | Civil Appeal | General | Other | Disposition Filed/Case Closed |
| 32031 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 03/25/1998 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Direct | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 31670 | PECKHAM (GARY) VS. STATE | 01/12/1998 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Direct | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |

51 to 79 of 79 rows are displayed. [Previous](#)

Appellate Case Management System

COURT OF APPEALS - SEARCH OF CASES

Find Case...

Cases

Case Search

Participant Search

Disclaimer: The information and documents available here should not be relied upon as an official record of action. Only filed documents can be viewed. Some documents received in a case may not be available for viewing. Some documents originating from a lower court, including records and appendices, may not be available for viewing. For official records, please contact the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Nevada at (775) 684-1600.

Search for Case

Search

Case No.: Caption Contains: peck

Exclude Closed: ☐

Clear

Search

1 to 50 of 79 rows are displayed. Next

Search Results

| ▲ Case No. ▼ | Short Caption | ▲ Filed Date ▼ | ▲ Category ▼ | ▲ Type ▼ | ▲ Subtype ▼ | ▲ Case Status ▼ |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------------------|---|
| 75179 | PECK VS. STATE | 02/26/2018 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Briefing in Progress |
| 75171 | PECK VS. STATE, DEP'T OF CORR. | 02/23/2018 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Disposition Filed |
| 75141 | PECK VS. STATE, DEP'T OF CORR. | 02/21/2018 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Petition Filed |
| 75026 | PECK VS. STATE | 02/05/2018 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Briefing in Progress |
| 74950 | PECK VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 01/25/2018 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Disposition Filed |
| 74008 | PECK VS. STATE | 09/20/2017 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Screening Completed |
| 73780 | PECK VS. THE EIGHTH JUD. DIST. CT. | 08/21/2017 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 73228 | PECK VS. STATE | 06/13/2017 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 73197 | PECK VS. STATE, DEP'T OF CORR. | 06/08/2017 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Transferred to Court of Appeals |
| 72932 | PECKHAM VS. MCCLOUD (CHILD CUSTODY) | 05/03/2017 | Civil Appeal | Family Law | Child Custody/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 72849 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 04/20/2017 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post-Conviction/Proper Person | Petition for Review Denied/Disposition Filed |
| 72680 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 03/20/2017 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Disposition Filed/Case Closed |
| 72585 | PECK VS. STATE, DEP'T OF CORR. | 03/15/2017 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 71955 | IN RE DISCIPLINE OF DAVID SPECKMAN | 12/20/2016 | Bar Matter | SCR 111 | Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 71021 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 08/12/2016 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Other/Proper Person | Disposition Filed/Case Closed |
| 70890 | PECK VS. STATE, DEP'T OF CORR. | 07/27/2016 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 70490 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 06/03/2016 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post-Conviction/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 69633 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 01/22/2016 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur |

| | | | | | | Issued/Case Closed |
|-------|---|------------|---------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 69339 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 12/10/2015 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 69182 | PECK VS. WASHOE CNTY. | 11/18/2015 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 69181 | PECK VS. WILSON | 11/18/2015 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 68827 | PECK VS. STATE, DEPT OF CORRECTIONS | 09/16/2015 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Disposition Filed/Case Closed |
| 68825 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 09/16/2015 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 68798 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 09/11/2015 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 68664 | PECK VS. VALLEY HOSP. MED. CTR. | 08/20/2015 | Civil Appeal | General | Pro Bono Program | Disposition Filed |
| 68520 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 07/30/2015 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 68453 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 07/22/2015 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Other/Proper Person | Disposition Filed/Case Closed |
| 68294 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 06/25/2015 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 67902 | PECK VS. WILSON | 04/30/2015 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 67775 | PECK VS. WASHOE CNTY. | 04/10/2015 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 66570 | ROBINSON VS. DIST. CT. (UNIV. OF NEVADA, RENO) | 09/24/2014 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 66306 | PECK VS. DONAT | 08/19/2014 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 66236 | PECK VS. STATE | 08/06/2014 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 65892 | COX VS. STATE OF NEV. | 06/19/2014 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 65691 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 05/19/2014 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post- Conviction/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 65521 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 04/25/2014 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post- Conviction/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 64510 | PECK (FRANK) VS. WHORTON | 12/02/2013 | Criminal Appeal | Other | Post- Conviction/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 64293 | PECK (FRANK) VS. WARDEN | 10/29/2013 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 63974 | PECK (FRANK) VS. WARDEN | 09/10/2013 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Other/Proper Person | Disposition Filed/Case Closed |
| 63114 | PECK VS. WILSON | 05/02/2013 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 62908 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 04/02/2013 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 62778 | PECK VS. DIST. CT. (CROUSER) | 03/12/2013 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |

Case Search

| | | | | | | |
|-------|--|------------|------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 62678 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 02/25/2013 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 61738 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 09/20/2012 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 61688 | DUFF VS. DIST. CT. (PECK, ESQ.) | 09/13/2012 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 61534 | DUFF VS. PECK | 08/22/2012 | Civil Appeal | General | Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 61406 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 08/02/2012 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 61202 | PECK (FRANK) VS. DIST. CT. (STATE) | 07/03/2012 | Original Proceeding | Criminal | Proper Person Writ Petition | Notice in Lieu of Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |
| 61056 | PECK VS. DIST. CT. (CLARK CO.) | 06/14/2012 | Original Proceeding | Civil | Proper Person Writ Petition | Disposition Filed/Case Closed |
| 60678 | PECK (FRANK) VS. STATE | 05/16/2012 | Criminal Appeal | Life | Post- Conviction/Proper Person | Remittitur Issued/Case Closed |

1 to 50 of 78 rows are displayed. Next