

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * * * *

Justin Odell Langford,)
Appellant,)

Case No. 75825✓

Case No. 76075

Case No. 78144

-VS-

The State of Nevada,)
Respondent.)

FILED

JUN 03 2019

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

MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL

Comes now, Justin Odell Langford, Plaintiff in pro se, and moves the Court for an order appointing him counsel for the foregoing proceedings.

This motion is based upon all documents in the original record and/or appellate record herein, NRAP 46(c) and the following.

This Court may "appoint counsel to represent indigent criminal defendants and indigent habeas corpus petitioners in original proceedings" before it. NRAP 46(c). See also George v. State, 122 Nev. 1, 127 P.3d 1055 (2006) (Court may remand case to district court for appointment of counsel for appeal).

Appointment would properly promote justice herein, as (1) the issues at bar are complex, (2) the movant is financially unable to obtain counsel at his own expense, and (3) the issues presented in this matter are meritorious and entitle movant to relief. (Check if applicable) ☒ There are additional or

expanded reasons supporting appointment of counsel attached hereto on additional page(s), which are incorporated as if set

RECEIVED

JUN 03 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERK

19-24062

1 forth herein. These factors demonstrate the propriety of
2 appointment of counsel herein. See e.g. NRS 34.750(1) (examples
3 of criteria warranting appointment of counsel in habeas corpus
4 proceedings).

5 For the reasons set forth herein, the Court should order
6 the appointment of counsel for and in relation to the instant
7 proceedings.

8 Dated this 30th day of May, 2019.

9 Justin Odell Langford
10 Justin Odell Langford # 1159546
11 Lovelock Correctional Center
12 1200 Prison Road
13 Lovelock, Nevada 89419

14 _____ In Pro Se

15 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

16 I do certify that I mailed a true and correct copy of
17 the foregoing to the below address(es) on this 30th day of
18 May, 2019, by placing same in the U.S. Mail via
19 prison law library staff:

20 Document Prepared By:
21 Benjamin McCordy #1157357
22

23
24
25
26 Justin Odell Langford
27 Justin Odell Langford
28 Plaintiff In Pro Se

Appellant has all three listed cases on the foregoing motion which stem from denial of appointment of counsel and denial of an evidentiary hearing on Petitions for Writ of habeas corpus which were denied. The decisions were contrary to law, even though it was left up to the court's discretion to allow the appointment of counsel during the Appellant's Post Conviction Process, All of which due to the Complexity of the case and Filings, that requires in the interest of Fair and Proper Justice, the appointment of counsel as supported by the appellant's motion to appoint Counsel and supported by required affidavit. It is an unreasonable application of clearly established state & federal laws, and was based upon an unreasonable determination that was a bias & prejudice to this Appellant of the actual truth & facts. The District Court has abused its discretion and Power & Authority, by allowing the Clark County District Attorney's Office & by its staff DA Preparation of the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of law and to pretend the Judge was the one to prepare & sign said document that was questionable. If this court was to appoint Counsel to the said cases, so counsel can gather the evidence needed to prove claims or at the very least reverse all of these cases and order the lower courts to appoint counsel & do an evidentiary hearing where all evidence can be

presented so a true decision can be made. 8

One of appellants claims raised in his first petition had counsel been appointed and a evidentiary hearing been done there would be no appeals. Alt Appellant ask is it do the right thing. This Court in Gary Wayne Walters v. The State of Nevada, No 57862 entered an order of reversal for the same issues above that order was filed Mar 18 2011 (doc. No. 11-08419). This Court has seen Appellants petition for rehearing in which he references Gary Walters YouTube videos & his case were he proved the statutes invalid.