

1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2

3 DUSTIN BARRAL,

4 Appellant,

5 vs.

6 THE STATE OF NEVADA,

7 Respondant

CASE NUMBER: 85706

District Court Case No.: C2169095-1

FILED

DEC 28 2022

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

8 MOTION FOR COURT'S REVIEW OF THE ORIGINAL EXHIBITS

9 COMES NOW, Appellant, Dustin Barral, in pro se, requesting that this
10 honorable court review the original exhibits in the Appellants case.

11 This is made based upon all papers and pleadings in this case.

12 According to NRAP 30(d) it states "The court will not permit the
13 transmittal of original exhibits except upon a showing that the exhibits are
14 relevant to the issues raised on appeal, and that the court's review of the
15 original exhibits is necessary to the determination of the issues." For the
16 following reasons, the Appellant, believes this court should direct the
17 district court clerk to transmit the original exhibits and for this
18 court to review the exhibits:

19 REASONS

20 It should be noted to this court that the Appellant still has not
21 recieved an Order of Denial from District Court. It's been 6 weeks his
22 denial and he still does not know the exact issues/reasons why he
23 was denied. So the basis of this Motion is based on the court
24 minutes ^{minutes} he was sent. In the minutes from Nov 7th, 2022 the judge
25 said she denied his motion based on the State's Opposition.

RECEIVED
DEC 27 2022
ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERK

26 According to the State's Opposition pg 6 line 24 it states "Defendant's
27 repeated same assertions are nothing more than bare, naked claims..."

28 Also on pg 6 lines 25 through 28 the State says that the Appellant is

1 trying to make the State prove that the Nevada Revised Statutes are
2 unconstitutional. These are untrue assumptions. The Appellant never
3 once shifts the burden to the State. There are over 150 pages of
4 original exhibits that not only show that his claims are neither bare
5 or naked but these 150 pages are the proof of his argument and burden.
6 2. The State in its Opposition never acknowledges the existence of over 150
7 pages of exhibits. Those almost 30 exhibits are the foundation for the
8 Appellant's Motion and Memorandum.

9 CONCLUSION


10 For the above reasons this court should approve this motion and
11 direct the district court clerk to transmit the original exhibits for deis
12 court's review in the instant case.

13

14 Dated this 21 day of December, 2022

15

16



17

Dustin Barral # 1108615

18

LCC

19

1200 Prison Rd

20

Lovelock, NV 89419

21

Appellant in Pro Se

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1
2 I do hereby affirm that I mailed a true and correct copy of the
3 foregoing Motion FOR COURT'S REVIEW OF THE ORIGINAL EXHIBITS to the
4 following address(es) on this 21 day of December, 2022, by
5 placing same in the US mail via prison law library staff:

6 Clark County
7 District Attorney
8 200 Lewis Ave
9 LV, NV 89101

10
11 Dated this 21 day of December, 2022.

12 ~~DBL~~
13 Dustin Barral #1108615
14 LCC
15 1200 Prison Rd
16 Lovelock, NV 89419
17 Appellant in Pro Se

18
19 AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

20 The foregoing Motion for Court Review of the Original Exhibits does not
21 contain the social security number of any person, I swear.

22
23 Dated this 21 day of December, 2022.

24
25 ~~DBL~~
26 Dustin Barral
27 Appellant in Pro Se

28