

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLERK OF THE COURT

REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER 200 LEWIS AVENUE, 3rd FI. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89155-1160 (702) 671-4554 Electronically Filed Nov 28 2017 01:26 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

> Brandi J. Wendel Court Division Administrator

Steven D. Grierson Clerk of the Court

November 28, 2017

Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of the Court 201 South Carson Street, Suite 201 Carson City, Nevada 89701-4702

RE: STATE OF NEVADA vs. ALEXIS PLUNKETT S.C. CASE: 74169

D.C. CASE: C-17-324821-2

Dear Ms. Brown:

In response to the e-mail dated November 28, 2017, enclosed is a certified copy of the Notice of Entry of Order filed October 31, 2017 in the above referenced case. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (702) 671-0512.

Sincerely,

STEVEN D. GRIERSON, CLERK OF THE COURT

Amanda Hampton, Deputy Clerk

Electronically Filed 10/31/2017 3:08 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

NOTC 1 MICHAEL L. BECKER, ESQ. Nevada State Bar No: 8765 2 ADAM M. SOLINGER, ESQ. Nevada State Bar No: 13963 3 Las Vegas Defense Group 2970 W. Sahara Avenue 4 Las Vegas, NV 89102 5 Ph: (702) 333-3673 Fax: (702) 974-0524 6 Attorneys for Defendant 7 8 STATE OF NEVADA. 9 10 -vs.-11 ALEXIS PLUNKETT, 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Plaintiff, CASE NO.: C-17-324821-2 **DEPT NO.: XVII** Defendant.

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the above-entitled Court entered the following Order on the 31st day of October, 2017. A copy of the Court's Order is attached hereto as Exhibit "1".

DATED this 312 day of October 2017.

ADAM M. SOLINGER, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No.: 13963 2970 W. Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89102 Attorneys for Defendant

repen

26

25

19

20

21

22

23

24

Case Number: C-17-324821-2

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the <u>31</u> day of October, 2017, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER in the United States Mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to:

JAY P. RAHMAN, ESQ. Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Ave., 3rd Floor Las Vegas, NV 89155 702-671-2590

An Employee of LAS VEGAS DEFENSE GROUP, LLC.

EXHIBIT "1"

1 2 3 4 5 6	MICHAEL L. BECKER, ESQ. NEVADA BAR NO. 8765 ADAM M. SOLINGER, ESQ. NEVADA BAR NO. 13963 LAS VEGAS DEFENSE GROUP, LLC 2300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 450 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 (702) 331-2725 – Telephone (702) 974-0524 - Fax Attorneys for Defendant	
7	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
8		
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	
10	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. C-17-324821-2	
11	-vs-) DEPT. NO. XVII	l
12	ALEXIS PLUNKETT,)	١
13	Defendant.	l
14		
15	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED ORDER	
16	Defendant, ALEXIS PLUNKETT, by and through her attorneys of record, MICHAEL L.	
17		
18	BECKER, Esq. and ADAM M. SOLINGER, Esq., respectfully submit the following proposed	l
19	order per the Court's minute order dated September 21,2017 attached as Exhibit A. Per EJDCR	1
20	7.21, counsel has circulated this proposed order to the Plaintiff and the Plaintiff agrees with the	
21	content and form.	İ
22	October DATED this 3 day of September 2017.	
23	Respectfully submitted,	
24		
25	/s/ Adam M. Solinger ADAM M. SOLINGER, ESQ.	
26	Nevada Bar No. 13963 2300 W. Sahara Ave, Suite 450	
27	Las Vegas, NV 89102 Attorney for Petitioner	
28	Auomey for retuoner	

 $\mathcal{A}_{i}^{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}_{i}) = \mathbf{1}_{i}^{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{A}_{i}^{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}_{i}) + \mathbf{1}_{i}^{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}_{i})$

	t second to be
	ODR
1	MICHAEL L. BECKER, ESQ.
2	NEVADA BAR NO. 8765 ADAM M. SOLINGER, ESQ.
3	NEVADA BAR NO. 13963 LAS VEGAS DEFENSE GROUP, LLC
4	2300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 450 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
5 6	(702) 331-2725 – Telephone (702) 974-0524 - Fax Attorneys for Defendant
7	DISTRICT COURT
8	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
10) Plaintiff,)
11	(A) (A) (CASE NO. C-17-324821-2
12	-vs- DEPT. NO. XVII
13	ALEXIS PLUNKETT,) ORDER Defendant.
14)
15	
16	FINDINGS OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
17	
18	I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE
19	Petitioner ALEXIS PLUNKETT ("Petitioner") was charged by way of superseding grand
20	jury indictment, along with two (2) co-defendants, Andrew Arevalo and Rogelio Estrada, with
21	
22	fourteen (14) counts including: CONSPIRACY TO UNLAWFULLY POSSESS PORTABLE
23	TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE BY A PRISONER (Gross Misdemeanor – NRS 212.165,
24 25	199.480 - NOC 55248); and POSSESS PORTABLE TELECOMMUNICATION DEVICE BY
26	A PRISONER (Category D Felony – NRS 212.165 – NOC 58368).
27	Said indictment was the subject of a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. The Court
28	denied her petition holding that there was slight or marginal evidence that a crime was

committed and that Ms. Plunkett's argument regarding jurisdiction was improper as part of a pretrial writ.

During the hearing on September 21, 2017, the State conceded it was charging Ms. Plunkett under section 4 of the statute. Further, at the close of the hearing, the Court instructed defense counsel to prepare the Order and submit to the State to approve as to form and content. A Notice of Appeal was filed by the State prior to the Order being entered in this matter. Further, both counsel for Ms. Plunkett and the State were out of the jurisdiction subsequent to the hearing and advised the Court of the inability to submit the Order within 10 days after the hearing pursuant to E.D.C.R 7.21.

II. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

As relevant to this petition, Ms. Plunkett is alleged to have brought a cell phone into the Clark County Detention Center and that once she was visiting with her clients, she is alleged to have provided the phone to her clients to allow them to make or participate in calls and/or send messages and/or read text messages, which the State contends is unlawful under an aiding and abetting theory. However, every time a phone was brought into the jail, an authorization form was signed and completed by Ms. Plunkett. That form disclosed that she was bringing the phone in for the purpose of conducting case work.

III. ARGUMENT

A. Applicable Law

Under Nev. Rev. Stat. 174.095, "any defense or objection which is capable of determination without the trial of the general issue may be raised before trial by motion."

Additionally, a defendant may object that the indictment fails to allege a crime at any time before trial. See Nev. Rev. Stat. 174.105(3).

B. Discussion

Ms. Plunkett is not a prisoner and therefore cannot be directly charged with violating Nev. Rev. Stat. 212.165(4). Instead, any criminal culpability must be based upon some type of vicarious liability. The State argues that she is criminally culpable based on a theory of aiding and abetting the crime by helping her in-custody clients violate Section 4. However, this argument is unpersuasive.

The statute in question in here is distinguishable from those cited by the State because Sections 1 and 2 of 212.165 build in vicarious liability in the context of prisons. The State argues that one can be criminally culpable for aiding and abetting an ex-felon who possesses a firearm. While this is true, the ex-felon in possession statute does not include a separate vicarious liability section like the statute at issue in this case.

In looking at the legislative history, it is clear that the Legislature was only concerned with making sure persons in jails were covered under Nev. Rev. Stat. 212.165. During the hearings on the proposed amendment to existing law, at least one person brought up punishing the person that provides the phone to a jailee, but that was never acted upon by the Legislature.

Finally, the language of the sections at issue here demonstrate a clear intent for separate punishment. Specifically, Sections 1 and 2 discuss the vicarious liability of a "person" that provides and/or possesses a phone in a prison. In contrast, Sections 3 and 4 discuss the culpability of a "prisoner" that possess a phone in a prison or jail, respectively.

In sum, Nev. Rev. Stat. 212.165(4) is clear and only a prisoner can be sentenced under the statute. Ms. Plunkett was not a prisoner and therefore she cannot be held criminally culpable under section 4 of this statute; however, she could be held liable under sections 1 or 2 of Nev. Rev. Stat. 212.165.

//

Has.

.

IV. CONCLUSION

Section 4 clearly demonstrates an intent to punish a prisoner for possession of a cellphone without lawful authorization. Ms. Plunkett cannot be charged vicariously under Section 4 because Sections 1 and 2 show a clear legislative intent to carve out liability for vicarious liability in the provision of cell phone context. As a result, Ms. Plunkett cannot lawfully be charged with liability under Section 4.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is Granted. The indictment against Ms. Plunkett is hereby dismissed. The State is free to pursue other charges as the State deems appropriate.

DATED this day of October, 2017.

By:

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that service of the foregoing **DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED ORDER** was made this 3 | day of October, 2017 upon the appropriate parties hereto by depositing a true copy thereof in the United States mail, postage prepaid and addressed to:

JAY P. RAHMAN, ESQ. Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3rd Floor Las Vegas, NV 89155 (702) 671-2590

An employee of
LAS VEGAS DEFENSE GROUP,

of the torogeness of the specific

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mu} = \mathcal{A}^{\mu} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\mu} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\mu} = \mathcal{A}^{\mu} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\mu}$

-6-




200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89155-1160 (702) 671-4554

November 28, 2017 Case No.: C-17-324821-2

CERTIFICATION OF COPY

Steven D. Grierson, the Clerk of the Court of the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the hereinafter stated original document(s):



In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Eighth Judicial District Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada, at 12:29 PM on November 28, 2017.

STEVEN D. GRIERSON, CLERK OF THE COURT