

Arizona Supreme Court
Criminal Petition for Review-Post Conviction (ASC)

CR-24-0212-PR

STATE OF ARIZONA v LAMAR VALDEN SIMMONS

Appellate Case Information

Case Filed: 19-Aug-2024
 Case Closed:

Dept/Composition

Side 1. STATE OF ARIZONA, Respondent

(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA

- State of Arizona

Attorneys for: Respondent

Douglas Gerlach, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 6869)

Side 2. LAMAR VALDEN SIMMONS, Petitioner

(Litigant Group) LAMAR VALDEN SIMMONS

- Lamar Valden Simmons

PRO SE

CASE STATUS

Aug 19, 2024....Pending

PREDECESSOR CASE(S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
1 CA	1 CA-CR 23-0547 PRPC				
↳ MAR	CR 1987-001119		Justin Beresky, Judge on PC Comments: (none)		

7 PROCEEDING ENTRIES

- 19-Aug-2024 FILED: Motion for Extension of Time (Petitioner Simmons, Pro Se)
- 19-Aug-2024 Petitioner Simmons filed a "Motion for Extension of Time" on August 19, 2024. Pursuant to Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, 31.6(e) and Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, Rule 6(b), a motion for a procedural order must include a statement by the moving party of whether the other parties consent to, or object to, the entry of the order that is sought; or why the moving party was unable to contact the other parties before filing the motion, and the caption of a motion for procedural order must include the words, "Motion for Procedural Order." Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED the motion is denied without prejudice to Petitioner's ability to file a motion in compliance with Arizona Rules of Crim. Proc. Rule 31.6(e) and ARCAP 6(b). This matter is subject to dismissal if a compliant motion or petition for review is not filed by September 3, 2024. (Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk)
- 30-Aug-2024 FILED: Motion for Extension of Time for Filing Petition for Review (Petitioner Simmons, Pro Se)
- 30-Aug-2024 On August 19, 2024, Petitioner Simmons, Pro Se filed a "Motion for Extension of Time," requesting additional time to file a petition for review. The Court denied that motion as non-compliant with Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 31.6(e) and Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, Rule 6(b).

On August 30, 2024, Petitioner filed a second, non-compliant "Motion: for Extension of Time for Filing Petition for Review." Pursuant to Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 31.6(e) and Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, Rule 6(b), a motion for a procedural order must include: a statement by the moving party of whether the other parties consent to, or object to, the entry of the order that is sought; or why the moving party was unable to contact the other parties before filing the motion; and, the caption of a motion for procedural order must include the words, "Motion for Procedural Order." Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED the motion is denied without prejudice to Petitioner's ability to file a motion in compliance with Arizona Rules of Crim. Proc. Rule 31.6(e) and ARCAP Rule 6(b). This matter is subject to dismissal if a compliant motion or petition for review is not filed by September 16, 2024. (Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk)
- 13-Sep-2024 FILED: Motion: for Petition for Review (Petitioner Simmons, Pro Se)
- 13-Sep-2024 SENT: Letter to Petitioner Re: Certificate of Compliance
- 16-Sep-2024 FILED: Record from CofA: Electronic Record