## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DEVOHN MARKS,

Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent.

No. 80469 FILED AUG 2 5 2022

## ORDER DENYING MOTION

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction. Appellant's counsel has filed a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. Counsel states that although he obtained an extension of time to file a petition for en banc reconsideration, he has determined that no such petition is warranted. Counsel states he informed appellant of that decision and that counsel would be moving to withdraw, so that, if he chooses, appellant may file a pro se petition for en banc reconsideration.

The certificate of service attached to the motion to withdraw does not indicate that counsel served the motion on appellant as required. See NRAP 46(d)(3)(A). The motion is not accompanied by an affidavit or signed statement from appellant, see NRAP 46(d)(3)(A)(ii), and does not explain the reasons for the omission, see NRAP 46(d)(3)(B). And appellant is not permitted to file a pro se petition for en banc reconsideration in this matter. See NRAP 46A(b)(1) ("A defendant who is appealing from a judgment of conviction may not appear without counsel."). For these reasons, the motion to withdraw is denied.

It is so ORDERED.

4.20 C.J.

22-26890

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA cc: Devohn Marks Mario D. Valencia Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA