

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

STEVEN LAWRENCE DIXON,  
Appellant,  
vs.

Docket No. 87091  
Electronically Filed  
Feb 06 2024 10:43 AM  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

**OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT'S SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION  
OF TIME IN WHICH TO FILE ITS ANSWERING BRIEF**

COMES NOW, Appellant, STEVEN LAWRENCE DIXON, by and through Karla K. Butko, court-appointed counsel of record, and hereby opposes Respondent's second request for leave of court for an extension of time in which to file Respondent's Answering Brief in this matter.

Counsel certifies the following information to this Court:

1. Counsel discussed the first Respondent's motion to extend time with Mr. Dixon. He was unhappy with that motion but did not instruct counsel to object to the request.

2. Mr. Dixon left a message in which he was very upset with the filing last week for a second extension

of time for Respondent to file its answering brief.  
Mr. Dixon maintains his innocence on this case.

3. Historically, the Humboldt County District Attorney's Office has little respect for the rights of a Petitioner/Appellant in this setting. Every case is fraught with delay. In this fact setting, the State never even bothered to answer the petition or supplemental petition for writ of habeas corpus (postconviction) at the district court stage. The matter was submitted by Mr. Dixon's attorney because no filings were made by the district attorney's office. The District Court reviewed the matter and dismissed it by written order without access to court. Private counsel has a crazy work load as well and managed to file the Opening Brief on December 4, 2023, even during the holiday season. Mr. Dixon's Counsel even had to order a missing portion of the trial transcript.

4. The Respondent's Answering Brief does not involve an extremely long Appendix or a long trial transcript. The Appendix is only two volumes. The law involved in this case is fairly settled in the State of Nevada. There is no postconviction evidentiary hearing

transcript as the case did not receive a hearing.

5. Counsel directs this Court to David Morton v. State, Docket 83884; David Morton v. State, 86443, Pamela Erwin v. State, 84687 (Respondent ignored deadlines) and Leo Hunter v. State, 85409. In each of these appeals Respondent blamed work load as a factor for continuances.

6. Counsel understands how difficult it is to keep up with the pace of appellate litigation when a lengthy record and novel issues arise, but Mr. Dixon has made parole before he has gained access to an evidentiary hearing. He will be off parole before this appellate litigation gets decided, at this rate.

WHEREFORE, based upon the demand of Mr. Dixon, and upon the history of many, many Humboldt County appeals, counsel opposes Respondent's request for an extension of time in which to file Respondent's Answering Brief.

DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2024.

By: Karla K. Butko  
KARLA K. BUTKO, ESQ.  
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT  
P. O. Box 1249  
Verdi, NV 89439  
(775) 786-7118  
Nevada State Bar No. 3307

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRAP 25, I certify that I am an employee of KARLA K. BUTKO, LTD., P. O. Box 1249, Verdi, NV 89439, and that on this date I caused the foregoing document to be delivered to all parties to this action by

X e-flex delivery of the Nevada Supreme Court

addressed as follows:

Anthony Gordon  
Deputy District Attorney  
Humboldt County District Attorney's Office  
(Also by e-mail directly to Mr. Gordon.)

DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Karla K. Butko, Esq.