IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RANDALL LEE DAHL,

Electronically Filed Jan 27 2022 11:36 a.m. No. 83489 Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Respondent.

Appeal from a Judgment of Conviction in Case Number CR15-0747 The Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada The Honorable Scott N. Freeman, District Judge

JOINT APPENDIX VOLUME ONE

JOHN L. ARRASCADA Washoe County Public Defender

JOHN REESE PETTY Chief Deputy 350 South Center Street, 5th Floor Reno, Nevada 89501

Attorneys for Appellant

CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS
Washoe County District Attorney

JENNIFER P. NOBLE Chief Appellate Deputy One South Sierra Street, 7th Floor Reno, Nevada 89501

Attorneys for Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Indictment <u>filed</u> on May 13, 2015
2.	Judgment of Conviction filed on August 10, 2021 1JA 49
3.	Jury Instructions (1-34) <u>filed</u> on June 9, 2021 1JA 4
4.	Notice of Appeal <u>filed</u> on September 9, 2021 1JA 51
5.	Transcript of Proceedings: Trial <i>held</i> on June 7, 2021, <u>filed</u> on October 26, 2021
6.	Transcript of Proceedings: Trial <i>held</i> on June 8, 2021, <u>filed</u> on October 18, 2021
7.	Transcript of Proceedings: Trial <i>held</i> on June 9, 2021
8.	[Unused] Verdicts <u>filed</u> on June 9, 2021
9.	Verdict <u>filed</u> on June 9, 2021 1JA 41

RANDALL LE DAHL 3 Pages 2001 (25/13/2015 (27.4) 2005

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

DA #14-18913

RPD RP14-023645



ORIGINAL JACQUEU By:

MAY 1 3 2015

JACQUELINE BRYANT, CLERK

By: DEPUTY CLERK

CODE 1795 Christopher J. Hicks #7747 EP.O. Box 11130

Reno, NV 89520

(775) 328-3200

Attorney for State of Nevada

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

Case No.: CR J. D747

v.

Dept. No.: D09

RANDALL LEE DAHL,

Defendant.

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

2324

25

26

INDICTMENT

The defendant, RANDALL LEE DAHL, is accused by the Grand Jury of Washoe County, State of Nevada, of the following:

OPEN MURDER, a violation of NRS 200.010, a felony, in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant RANDALL LEE DAHL, on or about the 9th day of December, 2014, at Reno Township, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully, and with malice aforethought, deliberation, and premeditation, kill and murder John Gardner, a human being, by means of the defendant striking the victim several times about the head and body with his fists and/or choking the victim or a combination there of, thereby inflicting mortal

injuries upon the said John Gardner as a result of said beating from which he died on December 9th, 2014.

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any person.

Dated this ______ day of May, 2015.

CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS District Attorney

ROY L. STRALLA

DEPUTY District Attorney

The following are the names of witnesses examined before the Grand Jury: 2_ JAY BROUKER JEFFREY HOYT DANIEL MAHER PIOTR KUBICEK, MD "A TRUE BILL" "NO TRUE BILL" FOREMAN

FILED
Electronically
CR15-0747
2021-06-09 01:50:51
Alicia L. Lerud
Clerk of the Court
Transaction # 8487489

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE.

* * *

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

V.

RANDALL LEE DAHL,

Plaintiff,

Case No. CR15-0747

Dept. No. 9

Defendant.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY:

It is my duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies to this case, and it is your duty as jurors to follow the law as I shall state it to you, regardless of what you may think the law is or ought to be. On the other hand, it is your exclusive province to determine the facts in the case, and to consider and weigh the evidence for that purpose. The authority thus vested in you is not an arbitrary power, but must be exercised with sincere judgment, sound discretion, and in accordance with the rules of law stated to you.

Instruction No.__/_

The defendant in this matter, RANDALL LEE DAHL, is being tried upon an Indictment which was filed on the 13th day of May, 2105, in the Second Judicial District Court, charging the said defendant, RANDALL LEE DAHL, with:

OPEN MURDER, a violation of NRS 200.010, a Category A felony, (50006) in the manner following:

That the said defendant RANDALL LEE DAHL, on the 9th day of December, 2014, at Reno Township, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully, and with malice aforethought, deliberation, and premeditation, kill and murder John Gardner, a human being, by means of the defendant striking the victim several times about the head and body with his fists and/or choking the victim or a combination there of, thereby inflicting mortal injuries upon the said John Gardner as a result of said beating from which he died on December 9th, 2014.

To the charge stated in the Indictment, the defendant, RANDALL LEE DAHL, pled "NOT GUILTY".

An Indictment is a formal method of accusing a defendant of a crime. It is not evidence of any kind against the accused, and does not create any presumption or permit any inference of guilt.

If in these instructions, any rule, direction or idea is stated in varying ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none must be inferred by you. For that reason, you are not to single out any certain sentence, or any individual point or instruction, and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and to regard each in the light of all the others.

If, during this trial, I have said or done anything which has suggested to you that I am inclined to favor the position of either party, you will not be influenced by any such suggestion.

I have not expressed, nor intended to express, nor have I intended to intimate, any opinion as to which witnesses are or are not worthy of belief, what facts are or are not established, or what inference should be drawn from the evidence. If any expression of mine has seemed to indicate an opinion relating to any of these matters, I instruct you to disregard it.

There are two types of evidence which the jury may consider in this case. One is direct evidence, such as the testimony of an eyewitness. The other is circumstantial evidence, the proof of a chain of circumstances pointing to the existence or non-existence of another circumstance.

The law makes no distinction between direct and circumstantial evidence, but requires that before convicting a defendant, the jury be satisfied of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt from all the evidence in the case.

Neither the prosecution nor the defense is required to call as witnesses all persons who may appear to have some knowledge of the matters in question in this trial.



In every crime there must exist a union or joint operation of act and intent.

The burden is always upon the prosecution to prove both act and intent beyond a reasonable doubt.

Instruction No. _____

The burden rests upon the prosecution to establish every element of the crime with which the defendant is charged, and every element of the crime must be established beyond a reasonable doubt.

25 Instruction No. 9

A reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt, but is such a doubt as would govern or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life. If the minds of the jurors, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, are in such a condition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt. Doubt to be reasonable, must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

Every person charged with the commission of a crime shall be presumed innocent unless the contrary is proved by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden rests upon the prosecution to establish every element of the crime with which the defendant is charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

Instruction No. _____

1 | 2 | the case.

The evidence in a case consists of the testimony of the witnesses and all physical or documentary evidence which has been admitted.

Nothing that counsel say during the trial is evidence in

26 | 3

It is the duty of attorneys on each side of a case to object when the other side offers testimony or other evidence which counsel believes is not admissible.

When the court has sustained an objection to a question, the jury is to disregard the question and may draw no inference from the wording of it or speculate as to what the witness would have said if permitted to answer.

To the jury alone belongs the duty of weighing the evidence and determining the credibility of the witnesses. The degree of credit due a witness should be determined by his or her character, conduct, manner upon the stand, fears, bias, impartiality, reasonableness or unreasonableness of the statements he or she makes, and the strength or weakness of his or her recollections, viewed in the light of all the other facts in evidence.

If the jury believes that any witness has willfully sworn falsely, they may disregard the whole of the evidence of any such witness.

The penalty provided by law for the offense charged is not to be considered by the jury in arriving at a verdict.

Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to the consideration of the evidence your everyday common sense and judgment as reasonable men and women. Thus, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You may draw reasonable inferences which you feel are justified by the evidence, keeping in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy, passion, prejudice, or public opinion. Your decision should be the product of sincere judgment and sound discretion in accordance with these rules of law.



Intent may be proved by circumstantial evidence. It rarely can be established by any other means. While witnesses may see and hear and thus be able to give direct evidence of what a defendant does or fails to do, there can be no eyewitness account of a state of mind with which the acts were done or omitted, but what a defendant does or fails to do may indicate intent or lack of intent to commit the offense charged.

In determining the issue as to intent, the jury is entitled to consider any statements made and acts done or omitted by the accused, and all facts and circumstances in evidence which may aid determination of state of mind.

You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses and of the weight to be given to the testimony of each of them. In determining the credit to be given any witness you must take into account his or her ability and opportunity to observe, his or her memory, his or her manner while testifying, any interest, bias or prejudice he or she may have, and the reasonableness of his or her testimony considered in the light of all the evidence in the case.

A person is qualified to testify as an expert if he or she has special knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education sufficient to qualify him as an expert on the subject to which his or her testimony relates.

Duly qualified experts may give their opinions on questions in controversy at a trial. To assist you in deciding such questions, you may consider the opinion with the reasons given for it, if any, by the expert who gives the opinion. You may also consider the qualifications and credibility of the expert.

You are not bound to accept an expert opinion as conclusive, but should give to it the weight to which you find it to be entitled. You may disregard any such opinion if you find it to be unreasonable.

o c s e t

The testimony of a law enforcement official or a police officer should be considered by you just as any other evidence in the case, and in evaluating his or her credibility you should use the same guidelines which apply to the testimony of any witness. In no event should you give either greater or lesser credence to the testimony of any witness merely because he or she is, or was, a law enforcement official or police officer.

The elements of the crime of Murder are

1. The defendant,

- 2. on December 9, 2014,
- 3. in Washoe County, Nevada,
- 4. did willfully and unlawfully,
- 5. with malice aforethought, either expressed or implied,
- 6. kill JOHN GARDNER a human being.

Express malice is that deliberate intention to unlawfully take away the life of a fellow creature, which is manifested by external circumstances capable of proof.

Malice may be implied when no considerable provocation appears or when all the circumstances of the killing show an abandoned and malignant heart.

Malice aforethought, as used in the definition of murder, means the intentional doing of a wrongful act without legal cause or excuse, or what the law considers adequate provocation. The condition of mind described as malice aforethought may arise, not alone from anger, hatred, revenge or from particular ill will, spite or grudge toward the person killed, but may also result from any unjustifiable or unlawful motive or purpose to injure another, which proceeds from a heart fatally bent on mischief, or with reckless disregard of consequences and social duty.

"Aforethought" does not imply deliberation or the lapse of considerable time. It only means the required mental state must precede rather than follow the act.

25 | 26 | Instruction No. 23

Murder is divided into two degrees.

Murder of the first degree is murder which is willful, deliberate and premeditated.

Murder of the second degree is all other kinds of murder.

4 5

Murder of the first degree is murder which is perpetrated by means of any kind of willful, deliberate, and premeditated killing. All three elements--willfulness, deliberation, and premeditation--must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt before an accused can be convicted of first-degree murder.

Willfulness is the intent to kill. There need be no appreciable space of time between formation of the intent to kill and the act of killing.

Deliberation is the process of determining upon a course of action to kill as a result of thought, including weighing the reasons for and against the action and considering the consequences of the action.

A deliberate determination may be arrived at in a short period of time. But in all cases the determination must not be formed in passion, or if formed in passion, it must be carried out after there has been time for the passion to subside and deliberation to occur. A mere unconsidered and rash impulse is not deliberate, even though it includes the intent to kill.

Premeditation is a design, a determination to kill, distinctly formed in the mind by the time of the killing.

Premeditation need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute. It may be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind. For if the jury believes from the evidence that the act constituting the killing has been preceded by and has been the

result of premeditation, no matter how rapidly the act follows the premeditation, it is premeditated.

The law does not undertake to measure in units of time the length of the period during which the thought must be pondered before it can ripen into an intent to kill which is truly deliberate and premeditated. The time will vary with different individuals and under varying circumstances.

The true test is not the duration of time, but rather the extent of the reflection. A cold, calculated judgment and decision may be arrived at in a short period of time, but a mere unconsidered and rash impulse, even though it includes an intent to kill, is not deliberation and premeditation as will fix an unlawful killing as murder of the first degree.

No act committed by a person while in a state of voluntary intoxication shall be deemed less criminal by reason of the person's condition, but whenever the actual existence of any particular purpose, motive or intent is a necessary element to constitute a particular species or degree of crime, the fact of intoxication may be taken into consideration in determining the existence of the purpose, motive or intent.

First Degree Murder is a specific intent crime. Second Degree Murder and Manslaughter are not specific intent crimes, as neither requires proof of a particular purpose, motive, or intent.

This means that voluntary intoxication, if established, may be considered in determining the specific intent element of First Degree Murder. However, voluntary intoxication is not a defense to Second Degree Murder or Manslaughter, and may not be considered in determining the existence of the intent element of those offenses,

Manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice express or implied, and without a mixture of deliberation.

Manslaughter may be voluntary, upon a sudden heat of passion, caused by a provocation apparently sufficient to make the passion irresistible; or, involuntary, in the commission of the unlawful act, or a lawful act without due caution or circumspection.

In cases of voluntary manslaughter, there must be a serious and highly provoking injury of offense inflicted upon the person killing, sufficient to excite an irresistible passion in a reasonable person, or an attempt by the person killed to commit a serious personal injury on the person killing. Neither slight provocation nor an assault of a trivial nature will reduce a homicide from murder to manslaughter.

The killing must be the result of that sudden, violent impulse of passion supposed to be irresistible, for, if there should appear to have been an interval between the assault or provocation given for the killing, sufficient for the voice of reason and humanity to be heard, the killing shall be attributed to deliberate revenge and punished as murder.

The heat of passion which will reduce a homicide to manslaughter must be such a passion as naturally would be aroused in the mind of an ordinarily reasonable person in the same circumstances. A defendant is not permitted to set up his own standard of conduct and to justify or excuse himself because his passions were aroused unless the circumstances in which he was placed and the facts that confronted him were such as also would have aroused the passion of the ordinarily reasonable person, if likewise

///

23 / / /

1///

///

situated. The basic inquiry is whether or not, at the time of the killing, the reason of the defendant was obscured or disturbed by passion to such an extent as would cause the ordinarily reasonable person of average disposition to act rashly and without deliberation and reflection, and from such passion rather than from judgment.

Involuntary manslaughter is the killing of a human being, without any intent to do so and without malice, in the commission of an unlawful act, or in the commission of a lawful act which probably might produce such a consequence in an unlawful manner.

However, where the involuntary killing occurs in the commission of an unlawful act, which, in its consequences, naturally tends to destroy the life of a human being, or is committed in the prosecution of a felonious intent, the offense is murder.

 The Indictment in this case charges Open Murder, which includes the possible offenses of Murder of the First Degree, Murder of the Second Degree, Voluntary Manslaughter and Involuntary Manslaughter. The defendant may only be convicted of one of these offenses, if any.

You should first examine the evidence as it applies to Murder of the First degree. If you unanimously agree beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of Murder of the First Degree, you should sign the appropriate Verdict form and request the bailiff to return you to court.

If you cannot unanimously agree beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of Murder of the First Degree, you should then examine the evidence as it applies to Murder of the Second Degree. If you unanimously agree beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of Murder of the Second Degree, you should sign the appropriate Verdict form and ask the bailiff to return you to court.

If you cannot unanimously agree beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of Murder of the Second Degree, then you should examine the evidence as it applies to Voluntary Manslaughter. If you unanimously agree beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the crime of Voluntary Manslaughter, you should sign the appropriate Verdict form and request the bailiff to return you to court.

If you cannot unanimously agree beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of Voluntary Manslaughter, then you

should examine the evidence as it applies to Involuntary

Manslaughter. If you unanimously agree beyond a reasonable doubt that
the defendant is guilty of the crime of Involuntary Manslaughter, you
should sign the appropriate Verdict form and request the bailiff to
return you to court.

The defendant, of course, can be found Not Guilty of all the offenses enumerated.

Motive is not an element of the crime charged and need not be shown. However, you may consider motive as a circumstance in this case. Presence of motive may tend to establish guilt. Absence of motive may tend to establish innocence. You will therefore give its presence or absence, as the case may be, the weight to which you find it to be entitled.

The law does not compel a defendant in a criminal case to take the stand and testify, and no presumption may be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn, from the failure of a defendant to testify.

It is your duty as jurors to consult with one another and to deliberate, with a view of reaching an agreement, if you can do so without violence to your individual judgment. You each must decide the case for yourself, but should do so only after a consideration of the case with your fellow jurors, and you should not hesitate to change an opinion when convinced that it is erroneous. However, you should not be influenced to vote in any way on any question submitted to you by the single fact that a majority of the jurors, or any of them, favor such a decision. In other words, you should not surrender your honest convictions concerning the effect or weight of evidence for the mere purpose of returning a verdict or solely because of the opinion of the other jurors.

Upon retiring to the jury room you will select one of your number to act as foreperson, who will preside over your deliberations and who will sign a verdict to which you agree.

When all twelve (12) of you have agreed upon a verdict, the foreperson should sign and date the same and request the Bailiff to return you to court.

DISTRICT JUDGE

FILED
Electronically
CR15-0747
2021-06-09 04:59:59 PM
Alicia L. Lerud
Clerk of the Court
Transaction # 8488249

1	CODE 4245
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
7	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE.
8	* * *
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,
10	Plaintiff, Case No. CR15-0747
11	v. Dept. No. 9
12	RANDALL LEE DAHL,
13	Defendant.
14	VERDICT
15	We, the jury in the above-entitled matter, find the
16	defendant, RANDALL LEE DAHL, GUILTY of SECOND DEGREE MURDER.
17	
18	DATED this day of June, 2021.
19	
20	FOREPERSON
21	ON BEDINGON
22	
- 1	

FILED
Electronically
CR15-0747
2021-06-09 05:03:27 PM
Alicia L Lerud
Clerk of the Court
Transaction # 8488254

CODE 4245 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintif Case No. CR15-0747 Dept. No. 9 RANDALL LEE DAHL Defendant. VERDICT the jury in the above-entitled matter, find the defendant, RANDALL LEE DAHL, NOT GUILTY of SECOND DEGREE MURDER. DATED this day of June, 2021. FOREPERSON

CODE 4245 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plainti Case No. CR15-0747 Dept. No. 9 RANDALL LEE DAHL, Defendant. VERDICT Hury in the above-entitled matter, find the defendant, RANDALL LEE DAHL, GUILTY of VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER. ATED this _____ day of June, 2021. FOREPERSON 26/

CODE 4245 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DIATRICT COUNT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plainti Case No. CR15-0747 Dept. No. 9 RANDALL LEE DAHL, Defendant. VERDICT by jury in the above-entitled matter, find the defendant, RAWDALL LEE DAHL, NOT GUILTY of VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER. DATED this _____ day of June, 2021. FOREPERSON

CODE 4245 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, WASHOE. IN AND FOR THE COUNTY THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintif Case No. CR15-0747 v. Dept. No. 9 RANDALL LEE DAHL, i Defendant. VERDICT We, the just in the above-entitled matter, find the defendant, RANDALL LEE DAHL, GUILTY of INVOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER. DATED this ____ day of June, 2021. FOREPERSON

CODE 4245 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DIATRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE. THE STATE OF NEVADA, plaintiff Case No. CR15-0747 Dept. No. 9 RANDALL LEE DAHL Defendant. VERDICT the jury in the above-entitled matter, find the defendant, RAMBALL LEE DAHL, NOT GUILTY OF INVOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER. TED this _____ day of June, 2021. FOREPERSON

CODE 4245 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, Case No. CR15-0747 V. Dept. No. 9 RANDALL LEE DAHL, befehdant VERDICT jury in the above-entitled matter, find the defendant, RANDALI LEE DAHL, GUILTY OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER. DATES this day of June, 2021. FOREPERSON

CODE 4245 IN THE SECOND JUDICIA DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE. THE STATE OF NEVADA Plaintiff, Case No. CR15-0747 Dept. No. 9 RANDALL LEE Defendant. VERDICT W, the jury in the above-entitled matter, find the RANDALL LEE DAHL, NOT GUILTY OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER. defendant, DATED this _____ day of June, 2021. FOREPERSON

FILED
Electronically
CR15-0747
2021-08-10 03:27:37 PM
Alicia L. Lerud
Clerk of the Court
Transaction # 8588386

CODE NO. 1850

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

RANDALL LEE DAHL,

VS.

 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

Plaintiff,

Case No. CR15-0747

Dept. No. 9

Defendant.

JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION

The Defendant having been found Guilty by a Jury, and no sufficient cause being shown by Defendant as to why judgment should not be pronounced against him, the Court rendered judgment as follows:

That Randall Lee Dahl is guilty of the crime of Second Degree Murder, a violation of NRS 200.010, a category A felony, as charged in the Indictment, and that he be punished by imprisonment in the Nevada Department of Corrections for the term of Life With the Possibility of Parole Beginning After a Minimum Term of Ten (10) Years have been served. The Defendant is given two thousand four hundred thirty-five (2435) days credit for time served.

The Defendant is further ordered to pay a Three Dollar (\$3.00) administrative assessment for obtaining a biological specimen and conducting a genetic marker analysis, a Twenty-Five Dollar (\$25.00) administrative assessment fee, a One Hundred Fifty Dollar (\$150.00) DNA analysis fee and attorney's fees for legal representation by the Washoe

County Public Defender's Office in the sum of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00) to the Clerk of the Second Judicial District Court.

Any fine, fee administrative assessment or restitution imposed today (as reflected in this Judgment) constitutes a lien, as defined in Nevada Revised Statute NRS 176.275. Should the Defendant not pay these fines, fees, or assessments, collection efforts may be undertaken against Randall Lee Dahl.

DATED this 9th day of August, 2021.

DISTRICT JUDGE

FILED
Electronically
CR15-0747
2021-09-09 07:39:35 AM
Alicia L. Lerud
Clerk of the Court
Transaction # 8636707 : yvlloria

CODE NO. 2515
WASHOE COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
JOHN REESE PETTY, State Bar Number 10
350 South Center Street, 5th Floor
Reno, Nevada 89501
(775) 337-4827
jpetty@washoecounty.us
Attorney for Defendant

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

20

Case No. CR15-0747

RANDALL LEE DAHL,

Dept. No. 9

Defendant.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Defendant, Randall Lee Dahl, hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of Nevada from the judgment of conviction in this action on August 10, 2021.

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

DATED this 9th day of September 2021.

JOHN L. ARRASCADA WASHOE COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

By: /s/ <u>John Reese Petty</u> JOHN REESE PETTY, Chief Deputy

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Washoe County Public

Defender's Office, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, and that on this date I forwarded
a true copy of the foregoing document addressed to:

RANDALL LEE DAHL (#1247561) Northern Nevada Correctional Center P.O. Box 7000 Carson City, Nevada 89702

JENNIFER P. NOBLE Chief Appellate Deputy Washoe County District Attorney's Office (*E-mail*)

AARON D. FORD Attorney General State of Nevada 100 N. Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701

DATED this 9th day of September 2021.

/s/ <u>John Reese Petty</u> JOHN REESE PETTY

3

1

2

4)

5

6

7

,

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

11

23

25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on the 27th day of January 2022. Electronic Service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

> Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Appellate Deputy, Washoe County District Attorney

I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:

Randall Lee Dahl (#1247561) Northern Nevada Correctional Center P.O. Box 7000 Carson City, Nevada 89702

> John Reese Petty Washoe County Public Defender's Office