1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA				
2					
3	GENARO RICHARD PERRY,		S.Ct. No. 82060 Electronically Filed		
4	Petitioner,		Jul 14 2021 10:32 p.m. D.C. No. C2988 Elizabeth A. Brown		
5	VS.		Clerk of Supreme Court		
6	RENEE BAKER, WARDEN		DOCKETING STATEMENT		
7	Lovelock Correctional Center,		CRIMINAL APPEALS		
8	Respondent.				
9		1000p on work			
10		GENERAL INFO	DDM ATION		
11		GENERAL INFO	OKMATION		
12	1. Ę	Eighth Judicial District; Clark Count udge Jacqueline Bluth; District Cou	y, Department XI		
13	J	udge Jacqueline Bluth; District Cou	rt Case No. C298879-1		
14	2. C	On September 29, 2015, Appel	ant was sentenced as follows:		
15		-			
16			adly Weapon (maximum of 120 months and		
	minimum of 36 months, plus a consecutive sentence of maximum of 120 months and minimum of 36 months for the use of a deadly weapon);				
17	Count 2 - False Imprisonment with Use of a Deadly Weapon (maximum of 60				
18	months and minimum of 18 months, concurrent with Count 1); Count 3 -Grand Larceny Auto (maximum of 96 months and minimum of 24 months,				
19	consecutive to Counts I and 2);				
20		Count 4 -Assault with a Deadly Weap 8 months, concurrent with Count 3)	on (maximum of 60 months and minimum of		
21	Count 5 - Coercion (maximum of 60 months and minimum of 18				
22		nonths, concurrent with Count 4); Count 6 - Battery Resulting in Subs	tantial Rodily Harm Constituting Domestic		
23	Count 6 - Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm Constituting Domestic Violence (maximum of 48 months and minimum of 18 months, concurrent with				
24		Count 5); and Count 7 - Preventing or Dissuading Witness or Victim from Reporting Crime or			
25		Commencing	withess of vicinii from Reporting Crime of		
26	Prosecution (maximum of 36 months and minimum of 12 months, concurrent with Count 6).				
27		,			
28	b	) The Appellant's sentence has not l	peen stayed.		

1		c) The Appellant has no	ot been admitted to bail pending appeal.
2	3.	Appellant had appointe	ed counsel represented himself in District Court on
3		Department to Conduct	Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the
4		subject of this appeal.	at Crime Scene (10st-Conviction), which is the
5	4.	Attorney filing this doc	rketing statement:
6	т.	Jean J. Schwartzer, Esc 170 S. Green Valley Pa	].
7		Henderson, NV 89012 (702) 979-9941	ikway 11500
8		(102) 515 5511	
9	5.	Appellate counsel is ap	pointed.
10	6.	Respondent Attorney: Chief Deputy District Attorney Alexander Chen Clark County District Attorney's Office 200 Lewis Avenue, 9 <sup>th</sup> Floor	
11			
12	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155		155
13		(702) 671-2750	
14	7.	Disposition Below:	
15		Denial of Post-Conviction Motion.	
16			
17	8.	N/A	
18			
19	9.	Appellant is in favor of proceeding in an expedited manner.	
20			
21	10.	Prior proceedings in this court:	
22		82931:	Perry v. State of Nevada (Direct Appeal)
23			
24	11.	Prior proceedings in other	her courts:
25			
26		C298879-1:	State of Nevada v. Perry (Criminal Trial)
27		C298879-1 :	Perry v. Warden (Petition for Writ of Habeas
28			Corpus (Post-Conviction))

12. Appellant was convicted of the following crimes: Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon False Imprisonment with Use of a Deadly Weapon Grand Larcery Auto Assault with a Deadly Weapon Coercion Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm Constituting Domestic Violence Preventing or Dissuading Witness or Victim from Reporting Crime or Commencing Prosecution Appellant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on appeal by the Supreme Court of Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was Appellant's Bood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A		
False Imprisonment with Use of a Deadly Weapon Grand Larceny Auto Assault with a Deadly Weapon Coercion Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm Constituting Domestic Violence Preventing or Dissuading Witness or Victim from Reporting Crime or Commencing Prosecution  Appellant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on appeal by the Supreme Court of Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A	1	12. Appellant was convicted of the following crimes:
Grand Larceny Auto Assault with a Deadly Weapon Coercion Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm Constituting Domestic Violence Preventing or Dissuading Witness or Victim from Reporting Crime or Commencing Prosecution  Appellant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on appeal by the Supreme Court of Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal: a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	2	Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon
Assault with a Deadly Weapon Coercion Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm Constituting Domestic Violence Preventing or Dissuading Witness or Victim from Reporting Crime or Commencing Prosecution  Appellant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on appeal by the Supreme Court of Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	3	
Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm Constituting Domestic Violence Preventing or Dissuading Witness or Victim from Reporting Crime or Commencing Prosecution  Appellant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on appeal by the Supreme Court of Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A	4	Assault with a Deadly Weapon
Violence Preventing or Dissuading Witness or Victim from Reporting Crime or Commencing Prosecution  Appellant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on appeal by the Supreme Court of Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	5	
Preventing or Dissuading Witness or Victim from Reporting Crime or Commencing Prosecution  Appellant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on appeal by the Supreme Court of Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		Violence
Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		
Nevada. That being said, this Court ruled that it was an abuse of discretion to not allow a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.  Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was fleed alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	8	Annellant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on anneal by the Supreme Court of
Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), which is still pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	9	
pending. One of the claims raised in his Petition was that his counsel was ineffective for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	10	a self defense instruction. This error was deemed harmless.
for failing to have genetic marker and latent print analysis conducted on the blood on the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	11	
the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	12	
have shown that it was Appellant's blood on the knife. Additionally, analysis would have shown that it was the alleged victim's fingerprints on the handle, not Appellant's. This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	13	the weapon. This was ineffective because had such analysis been conducted would
This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and or the ruling on the direct appeal.  Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		
Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		This would have supported his self-defense claim and changed the outcome of trial and
Appellant filed a Motion requesting such analysis because without doing so, his claim in his Petition will be a bare and naked allegation. There is no way for Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	16	or the runng on the direct appear.
Appellant to establish his claim unless he can demonstrate how a better investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		
investigation could have changed the outcome of trial.  This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
This Court denied Appellant's Motion.  13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal:  a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		
<ul> <li>13. Issues Appellant is raising in this appeal: <ul> <li>a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order</li> <li>Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime</li> <li>Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>14. N/A</li> <li>15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of</li> </ul>		This Court denied Appellant's Motion.
a) The District Court erred in denying Appellant's Motion Requesting Order Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		
Directing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to Conduct Genetic Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		
Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.  14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		
25 26 14. N/A 27 15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		Marker and Latent Fingerprint Analysis of Evidence Impounded at Crime
14. N/A  15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of		Scene (Post-Conviction), which is the subject of this appeal.
27 15. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	25	14. N/A
13. Pursuant to NRAP 17(b)(3), this case is presumptively routed to the Court of	26	
-		

1		that involves a challenge to a judgment of conviction or sentence for offenses that are not category A felonies.		
2	'	that are not eategory 14 felomes.		
3	16. F	16. First Impression? No.		
4	P	Public Interest? No.		
5				
6	17. T	17. The jury trial in this matter lasted eight (3) days.		
7				
8	18. I	18.I agree with the submission of this appeal for disposition without oral		
9	a	argument.		
10				
11		TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL		
12	19.	The District Court announced its decision to deny Appellant's Motion on		
13	February 17, 2021.			
14				
15	20.	The District Court filed its Order Denying Defendant's Motion on April 16, 2021.		
16				
17	21.	Notice of Entry of Decision and Order had not yet been filed.		
18				
19	22.	N/A.		
20				
21	23.	The Notice of Appeal was filed on May 14, 2021.		
22				
23	24.	The statute governing the time limit for filing the Notice of Appeal is NRAP 4(b).		
24	25			
25	25.	The statute which grants this Court jurisdiction to review the instant appeal is NRS 177.015(3).		
26				
27				
28				

1					
2	V	ERIFICATION			
3	I certify that the information p	I certify that the information provided in this docketing statement is true and			
4	complete to the best of my knowledge	complete to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.			
5					
6	Genaro Perry	Jean J. Schwartzer			
7	,				
8	July 14, 2021	/s/ Jean Schwartzer			
9					
10					
11	Dated this 14 <sup>th</sup> day of July, 2	2021.			
12		4C 11 1 144 1			
13	Re	espectfully submitted,			
14		/s/ Jean J. Schwartzer JEAN J. SCHWARTZER, ESQ Nevada State Bar No. 11223			
15		Nevada State Bar No. 11223 Law Office of Jean J. Schwartzer, Ltd.			
16		170 S. Green Valley Parkway #300			
17		Henderson, Nevada 89012 T: (702) 979-9941 Jean.schwartzer@gmail.com			
18		Counsel for Appellant			
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28	1				

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I certify that on July 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021, an electronic copy of the foregoing DOCKETING STATEMENT was sent via the master transmission list with the Nevada Supreme Court to the following: AARON FORD, ESQ. Nevada Attorney General ALEXANDER CHEN, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney /s/ Jean J. Schwartzer JEAN J. SCHWARTZER, ESQ Nevada State Bar No. 11223 Law Office of Jean J. Schwartzer, Ltd. 170 S. Green Valley Parkway #300 Henderson, Nevada 89012 T: (702) 979-9941 Jean.schwartzer@gmail.com Counsel for Appellant