

	Judge Villani	Judge Herndon	Judge Bell	Judge Freeman
Rule 10	This rule is unnecessary. Judges know the issues and can choose to grant the stay. Waiting for a party motion or for the state's consent could defeat the purpose of issuing a stay.	I don't see Rule 10 issues. I never get ex parte requests for stays in my criminal cases.	I do not use this rule. This rule can be eliminated.	We don't use this rule.
Rule 17	This rule basically restates <i>Whitlock v. Salmon</i> , 104 Nev. 24, 752 P.2d 210 (1988), and <i>voire dire</i> is ultimately within the judge's discretion, so this rule is unnecessary. No one is providing proposed questions in criminal cases. This is an obvious rule like one that states "you should respect the judge."	Attorneys never refer to Rule 17, although I occasionally cite to it when they get too far astray in <i>voire dire</i> .	I read this rule to the attorneys before every trial. If the attorney asks a question that has already been asked and answered, I will interrupt them and this way they will know why. This is a general rule, not a criminal rule, so will exist even if not in the criminal rules. I don't know that this necessarily needs to be part of the criminal rules. Note: instead of "may permit counsel to supplement..." should say " <b>must</b> permit counsel to supplement..."	I tell the attorneys all the information in Rule 17 during <i>voire dire</i> , and I tell them that I don't allow lawyers to repeat their questions. So I don't use this rule.
Rule 18	This is another common sense rule. You should know to notify the court interpreter's office if you need an interpreter. The fee schedule should be through the court system, not in a criminal practice rule. This rule is unnecessary.	I don't really see any Rule 18 issues. However, attorneys routinely fail to notify the interpreter's office. We constantly have to call them during morning calendar.	This is a general rule that applies to both civil and criminal cases. This rule is problematic- there is an opinion letter from the DOJ that says the court has to pay for the interpreter and the court cannot require the requesting party to pay for the interpreter. This is bad language that may be a constitutional issue. Part (b) is weird because it suggests that the same interpreter would come to each proceeding within a case, and that is just not how these things work. We can ditch all of this rule except for the first sentence.	We provide the interpreter according to the DOJ rule. I agree with Judge Bell on this.
Rule 20		I don't really see any Rule 20 issues.		
	(a) Unnecessary. This is within the judge's discretion.		Unnecessary.	This is within the discretion of the court. This is not really necessary. See 11(a) comment needs to be revised. No longer applicable.
	(b) Necessary rule.		Unnecessary. This rule has been rewritten.	Good and appropriate.

( c ) Necessary rule. The defendant doesn't always know who their attorney is, and the attorney does not always file a notice of appearance.

(d) Unnecessary. The attorneys just show up, so this isn't an issue.

( e ) Necessary rule. The 8th has a very similar rule (7.74).

This rule doesn't hurt anything, but it is repetitive. Other than the part about transferring files, this rule is repetitive of (b).

Good and appropriate.

Unnecessary. This rule does not make sense.

Unnecessary. Do not need to file notice of appearance. Does not matter to me whether there is a lateral move between DA's and PD's. If you're the same office, then you are the same office.

The 8th has this rule (7.74). Not specific to criminal rule. Perhaps more of an ethics rule than a criminal rule.

Critical rule. This should stay.

Too difficult to conform the 8th to Washoe County's initial appearances rule. It isn't possible to do everything required in 2nd's rule. Rule 3.80 is problematic. Rule 3.50(b)- attorney's already have a Rule 11 obligation, so why do we need them to do an affidavit as well? Inconvenient. Why not just a statement of counsel? Write the rules in plain English. Rules should be self-contained. Avoid referencing other rules. Why is the standard of review on appeal for a Brady/Giglio violation different depending on whether the defense has asked for something or not. Weird distinction considering it is the prosecution's burden to produce. This has resulted in a tremendous amount of discovery requests because the defense feels they need to ask for everything under the sun to avoid the different SOR on appeal. Takes up a lot of the court's time. Perhaps can be addressed by the statewide criminal rules.

## Additional Notes

The Commission should be mindful that things are very different in the 8th than in the 2nd. The 2nd has 48% less cases than the 8th. Local rules are necessary to account for these differences. The 8th has 300+ murder cases and a 4-judge murder team. Washoe County has no need for a murder team because they do not have the same volume of murder cases. Washoe County might think that every judge should have a split docket, but that would remove the murder team in the 8th. Some rules should be statewide, like motion-practice rules. Judge Villani would like to see a discovery schedule for criminal cases like 16.1 for civil cases.