## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JULIA ANNE FRENCH, Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent. No. 50707

FILED

APR 1 1 2008

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

## ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a district court order denying appellant's post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; Connie J. Steinheimer, Judge.

On March 18, 2005, appellant Julia Anne French was convicted, pursuant to a guilty plea, of one count of possession of a document for the purpose of establishing a false identification or license. The district court sentenced French to serve a prison term of 12 to 36 months. French appealed, and this court affirmed the judgment of conviction.<sup>1</sup>

On March 31, 2006, French filed a proper person postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The State opposed the petition. The district court appointed counsel to represent French, and

(O) 1947A

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>French v. State, Docket No. 45133 (Order of Affirmance, January 24, 2006).

counsel filed a supplement to the petition. The district court calendared an evidentiary hearing on the petition. At the hearing, French's counsel informed the district court that French was voluntarily absent from the hearing. French's counsel did not present any evidence in support of the claims raised in the petition. The district court denied the petition, ruling that French "presented no evidence in support of any claims" and therefore failed to prove that defense counsel was ineffective or that French's guilty plea was invalid.

Citing to <u>Faretta v. California</u>,<sup>2</sup> French contends that the district court erred in denying her motion for self-representation. We disagree. This court has recognized that the constitutional right to self-representation discussed in <u>Faretta</u> is limited to self-representation during criminal trials.<sup>3</sup> A criminal defendant does not have a constitutional right to self-representation on direct appeal or in a post-conviction proceeding.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, the district court did not abuse its discretion by denying French's motion for self-representation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>422 U.S. 806 (1975).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>See Blandino v. State, 112 Nev. 352, 354, 914 P.2d 624, 626 (1996) (citing Faretta, 422 U.S. at 818-19).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>See id.; see also Martinez v. Court of Appeal of Cal., Fourth Appellate Dist., 528 U.S. 152 (2000).

Additionally, French has failed to set forth a cogent argument addressing whether the district court erred in denying her petition.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, we ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>6</sup>

Jamin

J.

J.

Maupin

Cherry

Saitta

cc: Hon. Connie J. Steinheimer, District Judge
Kay Ellen Armstrong
Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto/Carson City
Washoe County District Attorney Richard A. Gammick
Washoe District Court Clerk
Julia Ann French

<sup>6</sup>Because French is represented by counsel in this matter, we decline to grant her permission to file documents in proper person in this court. See NRAP 46(b). Accordingly, this court shall take no action on and shall not consider the proper person documents that French has submitted to this court in this matter. On March 7, 2008, French's counsel filed a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. Counsel's motion to withdraw is denied.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>See Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984); Riley v. State, 110 Nev. 638, 878 P.2d 272 (1994).