

1 **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

2
3 **LARRY JAY TOM**

4 Appellant,

5 vs.

6 **STATE OF NEVADA**

7 Respondent.

8
9 **RESPONDENT'S ANSWERING BRIEF**

10
11 Appeal from Judgment of Conviction
12 Sixth Judicial District Court, County of Humboldt
13 The Honorable Michael R. Montero

14
15
16
17 **ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT**

18 Anthony R. Gordon
19 Deputy District Attorney
20 Nevada State Bar No. 2278
21 Humboldt County
22 District Attorney's Office
23 501 S. Bridge Street
24 PO Box 909
25 Winnemucca, NV 89446
 (775) 623-6360 Phone
 (775) 623-6365 Fax

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

 Matt Stermitz
 Nevada State Bar No. 3610
 Humboldt County Public Defender
 P.O. Box 309
 Winnemucca, NV 89446
 (775) 623-6550

 Electronically Filed
 May 31 2022 11:27 p.m.
 Elizabeth A. Brown
 Clerk of Supreme Court

 Docket No. 84287
 District Court No. CR 21-7273

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	ii, iii
Jurisdictional Statement	1
Routing Statement	1
Statement of the Issues	1
Statement of the Case	1
Statement of the Facts	1,2
Standard of Review	2
Argument	2-6
Conclusion	6
Certificate of Compliance	7, 8
Certificate of Service	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Davenport v. State</i> , 112 Nev. 475, 915 P.2d 878 (1996)	3, 5
<i>Dressier v. State</i> , 107 Nev. 686, 819 P.2d 1288 (1991)	3
<i>Hobbs v. State</i> , 127 Nev. 234, 251 P.3d 177 (2011)	3
<i>Koenig v. State</i> , 99 Nev. 780, 672 P.2d 37 (1983)	3, 5
<i>Picetti v. State</i> , 124 Nev. 782, 192 P.3d 704 (2008)	3, 4, 5
<i>Pettipas v. State</i> , 106 Nev. 377, 794 P.2d. 705 (1990)	4
<i>State v. Freese</i> , 116 Nev. 1097, 13 P.3d 442 (2000)	3

Statutes

18 U.S.C. §2243	2
NRS 239B.030	6
NRS 484C.110	1, 2, 6
NRS 484C.400	1, 6
5 th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution	2, 3
6 th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution	2, 3

1 JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

2 The Respondent does not object to Appellant's jurisdictional statement.

3 ROUTING STATEMENT

4 The Respondent does not object to Appellant's routing statement.

5 STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

6 Respondent objects to Appellant's statement of the issues and notes the issue
7 as follows:
8

9 ISSUE I: Are Appellant's Prior Misdemeanor Convictions for Driving Under
10 the Influence of Alcohol in violation of *NRS 484C.110*, in case # 14 CR 00222 and in
11 case # 14 CR 00960, both in the Union Township Justice Court, Humboldt County,
12 Nevada, Constitutionally Valid for Enhancement Purposes?
13

14 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

15 The Respondent does not object to Appellant's statement of the case.

16 STATEMENT OF FACTS

17 The Respondent objects to Appellant's statement of the facts. The facts of this
18 case arose due to Appellant, on or about September 22, 2019, driving a motor vehicle
19 at or near the location of Olavarria Street and Pioneer Road in McDermitt,
20 Humboldt County, Nevada, under the influence of an intoxicating liquor in violation
21 of *NRS 484C.110* and *NRS 484C.400*, after having committed two like offenses
22 within the last seven years, which had resulted in convictions, namely, an initial
23 conviction for *NRS 484C.110* in case # 14 CR 00222 in the Union Township Justice
24
25

1 Court, Humboldt County, Nevada Humboldt County, Nevada on April 29, 2014, and
2 a second subsequent conviction for *NRS 484C.110*, in case # 14 CR 00960, in the
3 Union Township Justice Court, Humboldt County, Nevada on December 10, 2019.
4
5 (*See Appellant's Appendix Pages 1-25*).¹

6 STANDARD OF REVIEW

7 The Respondent argues that the standard of review for Issue I is an abuse of
8 discretion standard.

9 ARGUMENT

10
11 ISSUE I: Appellant's Prior Misdemeanor convictions for Driving Under the
12 Influence of Alcohol in violation of *NRS 484C.110*, in case # 14 CR 00222 and in case
13 # 14 CR 00960, both in the Union Township Justice Court, Humboldt County,
14 Nevada, are Constitutionally Valid for Enhancement Purposes.

15
16 In the present case, Appellant challenges both his prior convictions in case # 14
17 CR 00222 and in case # 14 CR 00960, both in the Union Township Justice Court,
18 Humboldt County, Nevada, as being Constitutionally infirm in violation of the 5th

19
20 ¹ The time delay between the arrest in case # 14 CR 00960 on December 12, 2014,
21 and Appellant's subsequent conviction on December 10, 2019, resulted from
22 Appellant's supervision in an unrelated criminal case being revoked twice, initially on
23 January 13, 2015 for eighteen (18) months, and again on February 13, 2017, for
24 twenty-four (24) months, for a prior Federal conviction for Sexual Abuse of a Minor
25 in violation of *18 U.S.C. § 2243*, which Appellant was convicted for on April 18, 2011.
Appellant's criminal history information was before the District Court at sentencing in
this case through the Appellant's Presentence Sentencing Report prepared by the
State of Nevada. Department of Public Safety, Department of Parole and Probation.

1 Amendment and 6th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. (See *Appellant's Opening Brief*
2 *page 4*).

3 In *Hobbs v. State*, 127 Nev. 234, 251 P.3d 177 (2011), this Court noted:
4

5 "If the State seeks to use prior misdemeanor convictions to enhance a
6 current offense to a felony, it must also make an affirmative showing of
7 the constitutional validity of the prior convictions. *Dressier v. State*, 107
8 Nev. 686, 697, 819 P.2d 1288, 1295 (1991). This includes demonstrating
9 "either that counsel was present [during the prior misdemeanor
10 proceedings] or that the right to counsel was validly waived, and that the
11 spirit of constitutional principles was respected in the prior misdemeanor
12 proceedings." *Id.*" See *Hobbs v. State supra* 127 Nev. at 241, 251 P.3d at
13 181.

14 Three years earlier in *Picetti v. State*, 124 Nev. 782, 192 P.3d 704, 708 (2008), this
15 Court held in a similar vein that "in order to establish the validity of a prior
16 misdemeanor conviction offered for enhancement purposes, the State must
17 "affirmatively show either that counsel was present or that the right to counsel was
18 validly waived, and that the spirit of constitutional principles was respected." *Id.* See
19 also *Davenport v State*, 112 Nev. 475, 915 P.2d 878 (1996). In *Picetti*, this Court noted:

20 "Instead, we reaffirm our view that each case must be examined under
21 the totality of the facts and circumstances of that particular case.
22 Moreover, as this court concluded in *Koenig v. State*, "the realities of the
23 typical environment of such prosecutions in these courts of limited
24 jurisdiction cannot be ignored" and "the convenience of the parties and
25 the court should be given considerable weight."

Picetti v. State, 124 Nev. 782, 192 P.3d 704, 708, 709(2008).²

² See *Koenig v. State*, 99 Nev. 780, 672 P.2d 37 (1983) and *State v. Freese*, 116 Nev. 1097,
1104, 13 P.3d 442, 447 (2000) where this Court previously noted that the "[t]he
totality of the circumstances test has been the standard for reviewing the validity of
guilty pleas for some years."

1
2 Moreover, this Court has consistently required that the State initially shoulder
3 this burden under *Picetti v. State*, *supra*, when relaying on a prior misdemeanor for
4 enhancement purposes, *citing Koenig v. State*, 99 Nev. 780, 672 P.2d 37 (1983) and
5 *Pettipas v. State*, 106 Nev. 377, 794 P.2d. 705 (1990).
6

7 In the present case, after the Appellant objected to the admissibility of both his
8 convictions for case # 14 CR 00222, and in case # 14 CR 00960, before the Union
9 Township Justice Court, Humboldt County, Nevada, as the Appellant was not
10 represented by counsel during these two prior proceedings, the District Court
11 reviewed both of the Appellant's convictions in careful detail, and found that "these
12 are valid convictions for "first and second DUI offenses". (*Emphasis original*). (*See*
13 *Appellant's Appendix Pages 41-45*).
14

15 Before the District Court noted that the Appellant's conviction in case # 14 CR
16 00222 was valid, the District Court found that the Justice Court documents in case
17 # 14 CR 00222, indicated that while the Appellant was self-represented, the
18 documents clearly showed the entry of his plea of no contest; the violation in which
19 Appellant was being convicted of; the sentence Appellant was to receive; that the
20 Appellant understood and agreed to the conditions of his sentence; that he waived his
21 right to be represented by counsel; that there was a reference to his Constitutional
22 Right to be represented by an attorney at all stages of these proceedings; that if he
23
24
25

1 could not afford an attorney, one would be appointed to represent him at no cost; and
2 that the Appellant had initialed this particular paragraph, as well as having done so on
3 two similar paragraphs in the Justice Court documentation for case # 14 CR 00222.
4
5 (*See Appellant's Appendix Pages 1-9; 41-45*).

6 As to case # 14 CR 00960, the District Court also found that this conviction
7 was also valid for enhancement purposes in this case. (*See Appellant's Appendix Page*
8 *45*). Specifically, as to the Justice Court documentation in case # 14 CR 00960 before
9 the District Court, the District Court noted that one document is signed indicating
10 that the Appellant understood his sentence; agreed to the sentence he received; that
11 he initialed on the arrangement paperwork that he was entitled to an attorney and that
12 he waived the right to an attorney; that he waived his right a second time to be
13 represented by counsel, which he also initialed and signed; and that there was a DUI
14 admonishment of rights form which Appellant had initialed and signed. (*See*
15 *Appellant's Appendix Pages 10-21; 41-45*).

16
17
18 In summary, based on the totality of the facts and circumstances in this case,
19 and the realities of the typical environment of misdemeanor DUI prosecutions in the
20 limited jurisdiction of Justice Courts in Nevada, and based on the record below,
21 Respondent has affirmatively shown that the right to counsel was voluntarily waived
22 by Appellant in both of his convictions and that the spirit of constitutional principles
23 were fully respected, as noted under *Picetti, supra*, *Davenport, supra* and *Koenig, supra*, as
24 shown by the Justice Court documentation in both case # 14 CR 00222, and in case
25

1 # 14 CR 00960, before the Union Township Justice Court, Humboldt County,
2 Nevada. As a result, the District Court did not abuse its discretion by allowing these
3 two particular convictions, as described above, to be used in the present case to
4 enhance the Appellant's conviction for a violation of Driving Under the Influence of
5 an Intoxicating Liquor in violation of NRS 484C.110 and NRS 484C.400.
6

7 CONCLUSION

8 Based on the arguments above, the State of Nevada respectfully asks this Court
9 to affirm the sentence imposed in this case.
10

11 Furthermore, pursuant to NRS 239B.030, the undersigned hereby affirms this
12 document does not contain the social security number of any person.

13 Dated this the 31st day of May, 2022.

14 MICHAEL MACDONALD
15 Humboldt County District Attorney

16
17 By Anthony R. Gordon
18 ANTHONY R. GORDON
19 Nevada State Bar No. 2278
20 Deputy District Attorney
21 P.O. Box 909
22 Winnemucca, Nevada 89446
23 (775) 623-6360
24
25

1 ATTORNEY CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

2 I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements
3 of *NRAP 32(a)(4)*, the typeface requirements of *NRAP 32(a)(5)* and the type style
4 requirements of *NRAP 32(a)(6)* because this brief has been prepared in a
5 proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in type face of 14 point and
6 Garamond type face.
7

8 I further certify that this brief complies with the page or type volume
9 limitations of *NRAP 32(a)(7)* because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by
10 *NRAP 32(a)(7)(c)*, it does not exceed 30 pages.
11

12 Finally, I hereby certify that I have read the respondent brief and to the
13 best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for an
14 improper purpose. I further certify that this brief complies with all the applicable
15 *Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure*, in particular *NRAP 23(e)(1)*, which requires every
16 assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by a reference to
17 the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where the mater
18 relied on is to be found. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in
19 the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of
20
21

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Honorable Aaron Ford
Attorney General
100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Anthony R. Gordon
Employee, Humboldt County
District Attorney's Office.