

1 Justin Odell Langford © [1159546]

2 LCC, 1200 Prison Rd

3 Lovelock, Nv 89419

4 In Propia Persona

5

6

7

8 Justin Odell Langford,

9

Appellant, Supp. No.: 78144

10 -VS-

11 State of Nevada,

12 Appellee

13

14

15

16 TO: Supreme Court Justices

17

18 NRS's 220.110; 220.120; 220.170 were created in

19 1951 as an 'NRS' just look in the History section of the

20 statute for the proof. So I put to you this question 'How

21 do you create three(3) NRS's before Senate Bill No. 2

22 was even passed?' The Answer is you don't, so now I

23 put to you the fact that not one of those three(3)

24 NRS's have an enactment clause in them. So why is

25 the state citing false laws to back up false laws. This is

26 all fraud upon the Court, people involved need to

27 answer for their crimes!

28 So as discussed in Appellants Writ of Habeas?

29 represented to this Court in his motion to

19-23894

FILED

JUN 03 2019

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

SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA

JUDICIAL NOTICE

RECEIVED

MAY 31 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

1 reconsider denial of appeal (herein MTRDOA) the
2 enactment clause is required to be in all laws pursuant
3 to Nev. CONST. art. 4, §23. Also any NRS after 1957 is the
4 law of Nev. pursuant to Senate Bill No. 2. Let me point
5 this out to the Court, another fact that all laws prior
6 to 1957 were repealed by Senate Bill No. 2, so all three (3)
7 of those statutes have no force & effect. Also NRS
8 201.230 was created in 1961 but it was listed as
9 something else in 1911 & 1925 & 1947, but all laws prior to
10 1957 were repealed as discussed supra, by senate bill
11 no. 2 and the NRS was enacted as the law of
12 Nevada.

13 So NRS's are the law as stated by the
14 Legislature in Senate Bill No. 2, then where is the
15 enactment clause for NRS's 201.230 as required by
16 Nev. CONST. Art. 4, §23. Let me say where it is, it's
17 not there as required by the Constitution of this
18 state in which this Court is sworn to uphold. So as
19 you can see the states argument lacks merit, and this
20 court failed to address this issue originally in its order
21 of Affirmance thus you admitted I'm right in my
22 argument. See *Ylst v. Nunnemaker* (silence is
23 acquiescence). Now I ask this court to reverse my
24 conviction with prejudice.

25 DATED This 27 day of May, 2019.

26 *Is/John Odell Sanford*