

Arizona Supreme Court
Criminal Petition for Review - Appeal

CR-26-0171-PR

STATE OF ARIZONA v BISIMO EMEDI

Appellate Case Information

Case Filed: 9-Jun-2026
Case Closed:

Dept/Composition

Side 1. STATE OF ARIZONA, Appellee

(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA

- State of Arizona

Attorneys for: Appellee

Alice Jones, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 28062)

Brian Coffman, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 34580)

Side 2. BISIMO EMEDI, Appellant

(Litigant Group) BISIMO EMEDI

- Bisimo Emedi

PRO SE

CASE STATUS

Jun 9, 2026.....Pending

PREDECESSOR CASE (S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
1 CA 1 CA-CR 24-0191					
MAR CR2017-137283-001	See file	See file	Laura M Reckart, Sentencing Comments: (none)	JURY	

3 PROCEEDING ENTRIES

- 9-Jun-2026 FILED: [STRICKEN per Order Filed 7/14/2026] Petition for Review (Appellant Emedi, Pro Se)
- 9-Jun-2026 FILED: Motion for Procedural Order for Extension of Time to File Petition for Review (Appellant Emedi, Pro Se)
- 14-Jul-2026 On March 13, 2026 the Court of Appeals issued its memorandum decision and the Mandate issued on April 21, 2026. On June 9, 2026, Appellant filed his Petition for Review and Motion for Procedural Order for Extension of Time to File Petition for Review ("Motion for Extension"). Both filings were dated May 28, 2026 and postmarked June 6, 2026.

An appellant may seek review of a decision from the Court of Appeals. However, pursuant to Rule 31.21(b)(2)(A), any such petition is due no later than 30 days after the memorandum decision or 15 days after the final disposition of a timely petition for review. Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.21(b)(2)(A). Even if Appellant had shown that the filings were delivered for mailing on May 28, 2026, they were filed 75 days after the Court of Appeals' decision and are untimely by 45 days.

Appellant's only explanation is "Moved from complex to complex. Very limited library & legal access." However, this does not explain why Appellant could not have sought a timely extension. Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED denying the Motion for Extension and striking the untimely Petition for Review. This order is without prejudice to filing a motion for reconsideration explaining why Appellant was unable to file a timely request for extension, and may include information such as when he received the memorandum decision and what efforts he made to prepare a timely motion for extension. Any such motion for reconsideration is due no later than July 29, 2026. (Hon. John R. Lopez IV)