ORIGINAL

1		
1	IN THE SUPREME COURT	OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
2		
3		
4		
5	DALE EDWARD FLANAGAN,	
6	Appellant,	
7	v.	Case No. 40232
8	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	FILED
9	Respondent.	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
10		JUL 2 8 2005
11	OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE OVER-LENGTH BRIEF ANATTE M. BLOOM CLERK OF SUPPLIENCE COURT	
12	CAL J. POTTER, III, ESQ. Potter Law Offices	DAVID ROGER DEPUTY CLERK
13	Potter Law Offices Nevada Bar No. 001988	Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #002781
14	1125 Shadow Lane	Clark County Courthouse 200 South Third Street, Suite 701 Post Office Box 552212
15	Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 (702) 385-1954	Post Office Box 552212 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212
16	ROBERT D. NEWELL, ESO.	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 455-4711 State of Nevada
17	ROBERT D. NEWELL, ESQ. Oregon State Bar No. 79091 Davis Wright Tremain 1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue	BRIAN SANDOVAL
18	1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue Suite 2300	Nevada Attorney General Nevada Bar No. 003805
19	Portland, Oregon 97201 (503) 241-2300	100 North Carson Street
20	(303) 241-2300	Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (775) 684-1265
21		
22		
23		
24	·	
25		
26		
27		
28	Course for Appellant	Counsel for Respondent
20		

PPELLAT/WPDOCS/SECRETARY/MISC/FLANAGAN OPPOSITION TO OVERLENGTH BRIEF 40232.DOC JANETTE M. BLOOM GLERK OF SUPREME COURT DEPUTY CLERK

05-15013

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA	
2		
3		
4		
5	DALE EDWARD FLANAGAN,	
6	Appellant, {	
7	v. Case No. 40232	
8	THE STATE OF NEVADA, {	
9	Respondent.	
10	OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE OVER-LENGTH BRIEF	
11		
12		
13	COMES NOW the State of Nevada, by DAVID ROGER, Clark County District	
14	Attorney, through his Chief Deputy, STEVEN S. OWENS, respectfully moves for	
15	leave to file an Opposition to Motion for Leave to File Over-Length Brief.	
16	Dated July 26, 2005.	
17	Respectfully submitted,	
18 19	DAVID ROGER Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar # 002781	
20	11CVatta Bai # 002701	
21	BY SHIM (COUN)	
22	STEVENS OWENS	
23	Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #004352	
24	Attorney for Respondent	
25		
26		
27		
28		

I:\APPELLAT\WPDOCS\SECRETARY\MISC\FLANAGAN OPPOSITION TO OVERLENGTH EXIEF 40232.DOC

OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE OVER-LENGTH BRIEF

Procedural History

The instant action is an appeal from the denial of post-conviction relief in a capital case. Flanagan's initial Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was filed in district court on May 28, 1998. After a limited evidentiary hearing, detailed Findings of Fact were filed on August 9, 2002, denying the petition.

After numerous extensions of time from this Court including a remand to reconstruct parts of the record, Appellant has now submitted a 126-page Opening Brief and requests leave to file it. The State opposes the request and asks that the Opening Brief be limited to 80-pages in length in accord with the practices of this Court.

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Pursuant to NRAP Rule 28, briefs are not to exceed 30 pages in length except by permission of the court. This Court has recognized that there may be a need for briefs longer than 30 pages in special cases, such as in a direct appeal from a death sentence where the issues are complex. Hernandez v. State, 117 Nev. 463, 24 P.3d 767 (2001). However, the Court has also recognized that reasonable limitations on briefs are "necessary for the functioning of this court" and "are ordinary practices employed by courts to assist in the efficient management of the cases before them." Id. In Hernandez, after reviewing the proposed 124-page brief and considering the seriousness and complexity of the issues, this Court authorized the filing of only an 80-page brief.

Although the present case involves a death sentence, the issues are not particularly complex. A limited evidentiary hearing was held below on the single issue of ineffective assistance of counsel with regards to communication, while the

remaining claims were all denied as being without merit or procedurally barred. The 2 same concerns about brevity and conciseness in briefs that are necessary for this Court 3 to function efficiently are the same for the prosecutors who must read and respond to the verbose and excessive filings of opposing counsel. 80-pages is a reasonable 4 5 limitation imposed by this Court in other capital cases. To deviate from that now will 6 invite further attacks and challenges to the Court's efforts to manage its caseload efficiently. 7 8 WHEREFORE, the State respectfully opposes Appellant's Motion for Leave to 9 File 80 Page Opening Brief. 10 Dated July 26, 2005. Respectfully submitted, 11 12 DAVID ROGER Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar # 002781 13 14 BY 15 16 Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #004352 17 Attorney for Respondent 18 19 20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify and affirm that I mailed a copy of the foregoing Opposition to Motion for Leave to File Over-Length Brief to the attorneys of record listed below on July 26, 2005.

Cal J. Potter, Iii, Esq. Potter Law Offices 1125 Shadow Lane Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

Robert D. Newell, Esq. Oregon State Bar No. 79091 Davis Wright Tremain 1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue Suite 2300 Portland, Oregon 97201

Employee, Clark County District Attorney's Office

OWENS/none/english