

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

AMMAR ASIMFARUQ HARRIS,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 69509

FILED

JUL 26 2017

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS

Extraordinary circumstances and extreme need having been shown, respondent's motions requesting fourth and fifth extensions of time to file the answering brief are granted. NRAP 31(b)(3)(D); SCR 250(6)(e). Respondent shall have until August 17, 2017, to file and serve the answering brief. Any additional extensions will be granted only on showing of extraordinary circumstances and extreme need. NRAP 31(b)(3)(D); SCR 250(6)(e). Counsel's caseload normally will not be deemed such a circumstance. *Cf. Varnum v. Grady*, 90 Nev. 374, 528 P.2d 1027 (1974). Failure to timely file the answering brief may result in the imposition of sanctions.

Appellant has filed, in pro se, a letter requesting that his counsel raise a certain issue in this appeal. Alternatively, appellant asks that he be allowed to proceed in pro se.

The decision as to what issues to raise on appeal resides within counsel's professional judgment, *Jones v. Barnes*, 463 U.S. 745, 751-54 (1983), and therefore appellant has no right to insist that appellate counsel raise certain issues "if counsel, as a matter of [that] professional judgment, decides not to present those [issues]," *id.* at 751. Moreover, appellant may not represent himself in this direct appeal from a judgment of conviction.

17-24736

NRAP 46(a)(b)(1); *see also* *Martinez v. Court of Appeal of Cal.*, 528 U.S. 152 (2000); *Blandino v. State*, 112 Nev. 352, 914 P.2d 624 (1996). For these reasons, we cannot grant appellant's requests. Appellant should address all concerns regarding this appeal to his counsel.

It is so ORDERED.

_____*Cherry*_____, C.J.

cc: Robert L. Langford & Associates
Oronoz, Ericsson & Gaffney, LLC
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Ammar Asimfaruq Harris