Electronically Filed
8/28/2019 12:38 PM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT

CRAIG A. MUELLER, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 4703
MUELLER & ASSOCIATES, INC.
723 S. Seventh Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
P: (702) 382-1200
Attorney for Defendant

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent-Plaintiff, vs. MICHAEL LEE MCDONALD, Defendant.	Case No.: C-18-335284-1 Dept. No: 28 **MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

COMES NOW, MICHAEL MCDONALD, by and through his attorney of record, CRAIG A. MUELLER, of MUELLER & ASSOCIATES, INC., hereby submits this MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. This Motion is made and based upon all the papers and pleadings on file herein, attached points and authorities in support hereof, and oral argument at the time of hearing, if deemed necessary by this Honorable Court.

DATED this 28th day of August, 2019.

CRAIG A. MUELLER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 4703 .
723 S. Seventh Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
P: (702) 382-1200
Attorney for Defendant

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. Facts and Procedural History

Defendant Michael McDonald has no criminal record and has been through a contentious divorce process involving attempts by his former spouse to "press his buttons" to elicit a response. Camera coverage of criminal cases is unusual, and more unusual when the case is not a capital case and does not involved a defendant with a previous criminal record.

II. Law and Argument

Rule 230 of the Nevada Supreme Court Rules governing electronic coverage in court proceedings provide that, among the factors to be considered, are:

> (a) The impact of coverage upon the right of any party to a fair trial; (b) The impact of coverage upon the right of privacy of any party or witness; (c) The impact of coverage upon the safety and well-being of any party, witness or juror; (d) The likelihood that coverage would distract participants or would detract from the dignity of the proceedings; ...

Having media cameras pointed at Mr. McDonald for the duration of the proceedings would amount to nothing more than bear-baiting in this case. The divorce and forced separation of Mr. McDonald from his children have been extremely stressful. The actual information made available to the public from video of the court proceedings will be minimal. It would not elicit public knowledge nor inform the court. The point rather will be the potential for theater afforded by keeping the stress and distraction of a video camera trained on Mr. McDonald throughout, and to potentially capture and display an emotional response from Mr. McDonald if his wife succeeds in eliciting such a response from him.

III. Conclusion

The Court should reconsider its decision and revoke access to media cameras in this case.

DATED this 28th day of August, 2019.

CRAIG A. MUELLER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 4703
MUELLER & ASSOCIATES, INC.
723 S. Seventh Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
P: (702) 382-1200
Attorney for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 28th day of August, 2019, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing, upon each of the parties by electronic service through Wiznet pursuant to the Eighth Judicial District Court rules of service as follows:

Clark County District Attorney's Office
200 Lewis Ave, 3rd Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89155
motions@clarkcountyda.com
pdmotions@clarkcountyda.com

/s/ Anna Krajecki
An employee of
MUELLER & ASSOCIATES, INC.