

1 **Habeas Corpus Petition Grounds One (1) To Seventy-Nine (79) and Supporting Facts**

2 **KIRSTIN BLAISE LOBATO**

3 **v.**

4 **WARDEN OF FMWCC and**  
5 **THE STATE OF NEVADA**

6 **IN THE EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE**  
7 **STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK**

8 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

9 (a) Ground one..... 24  
10 New forensic entomology evidence that Duran Bailey’s time of death was after sunset on  
11 July 8, 2001, in Las Vegas, when it is known the Petitioner was 170 miles away in Panaca.

12 (b) Ground two..... 29  
13 New forensic pathology evidence that Duran Bailey’s time of death was after 8 pm on July  
14 8, 2001, in Las Vegas when it is known the Petitioner was 170 miles away in Panaca.

15 (c) Ground three..... 32  
16 New entomology and forensic pathology evidence that Duran Bailey’s body did not have  
17 cockroach and other predator bites establishes his time of death was close to discovery of  
18 his body in Las Vegas, when it is known the Petitioner was 170 miles away in Panaca.

19 (d) Ground four..... 36  
20 New expert psychology evidence the Petitioner’s Statement is not a confession to Bailey’s  
21 murder, and it describes a rape assault at a Budget Suites Hotel in east Las Vegas that  
22 occurred weeks before Bailey’s murder.

23 (e) Ground five..... 41  
24 New alibi witness evidence the rape assault at the Budget Suites Hotel described in the  
25 Petitioner’s Statement occurred prior to July 8, 2001, which undermines the credibility of  
26 Detective Thomas Thowsen’s opinion testimony the Petitioner’s Statement is a *de facto*  
27 confession, that the prosecution relied on in their jury arguments.

28 (f) Ground six..... 47  
New alibi witness evidence the Petitioner was in Panaca on July 6, July 7, and July 8, 2001,  
and she wasn’t under the influence of methamphetamine.

(g) Ground seven..... 51  
New forensic pathology evidence that more than one person was involved in Duran  
Bailey’s murder, and the Petitioner is excluded as the person who amputated his penis,  
corroborating that her Statement was about a different incident than Bailey’s murder.

1 (h) Ground eight..... 53  
2 New forensic pathology and crime scene evidence Duran Bailey was alive when his rectum  
3 was injured, so the Petitioner was convicted of a non-existent violation of NRS 201.450,  
4 which requires "sexual penetration" of a dead person.

4 (i) Ground nine..... 56  
5 New forensic pathology evidence that on July 8, 2001, Bailey experienced two attacks two  
6 hours apart that were likely separated by a meal.

6 (j) Ground ten..... 58  
7 New forensic pathology evidence related to the circumstances and time of Duran Bailey’s  
8 murder excludes the Petitioner as a perpetrator.

9 (k) Ground eleven. .... 69  
10 New forensic science evidence establishes the Petitioner’s black high-heeled open-toed  
11 platform shoes could not have been worn by Duran Bailey’s murderer.

11 (l) Ground twelve..... 73  
12 New forensic science evidence establishes the shoeprints imprinted in blood on cardboard  
13 and on concrete leading out of the trash enclosure were made by Duran Bailey’s murderer,  
14 and the Petitioner’s shoeprints are excluded.

14 (m) Ground thirteen. .... 78  
15 New forensic science evidence excludes the Petitioner and her car from the crime scene,  
16 and undermines the prosecution’s theory of the crime.

16 (n) Ground fourteen. .... 87  
17 New witness evidence Duran Bailey did not live in the trash enclosure where he was  
18 murdered establishes the Petitioner could not have known to go there “sometime before  
19 sunup” on July 8, 2001.

19 (o) Ground fifteen. .... 90  
20 New witness evidence that in July 2001 methamphetamine was readily available in Panaca  
21 within walking distance of the where the Petitioner was living, and in other nearby towns.

22 (p) Ground sixteen. .... 92  
23 New third-party culprit evidence that Diann Parker’s Mexican friends murdered Duran Bailey.

23 (q) Ground seventeen..... 102  
24 New third-party culprit evidence that three checks drawn from Duran Bailey’s Nevada State  
25 Bank account were negotiated for cash one to three days after his death.

26 (r) Ground eighteen..... 104  
27 New forensic science, dental and crime scene evidence the jury convicted the Petitioner based  
28 on the prosecution’s impossible theory of the crime that Bailey was hit in the mouth in the  
trash enclosure’s northwest corner, and fell backwards and hit his head on the southwest curb.

1 (s) Ground nineteen..... 110  
2 New legal evidence the Petitioner was convicted of a non-existent violation of NRS  
3 201.450 (Nevada’s necrophilia law).

4 (t) Ground twenty..... 115  
5 New witness evidence of jury misconduct that at least four of Petitioner’s jurors discussed  
6 the merits of the case prior to the close of evidence, and at least one of those jurors had  
7 decided on the Petitioner’s guilt.

8 (u) Ground twenty-one..... 117  
9 New evidence LVMPD Detective Thomas Thowsen testified perjuringly multiple times in  
10 an effort to falsely link the Petitioner to Duran Bailey’s murder.

11 (v) Ground twenty-two. .... 126  
12 New evidence of police and prosecutor misconduct in maliciously and negligently  
13 prosecuting the Petitioner when they had evidence the Petitioner did not murder Duran  
14 Bailey or cut his rectum after death.

15 (w) Ground twenty-three..... 133  
16 New forensic entomology, forensic pathology, forensic science, crime scene reconstruction,  
17 psychology, alibi witnesses, dental, third-party culprit, police perjury, and prosecution and  
18 police misconduct evidence establishes the Petitioner is actually and factually innocent of  
19 any involvement with the murder and cutting of Duran Bailey’s rectum on July 8, 2001.

20 (x) Ground twenty-four..... 147  
21 New evidence the Petitioner’s conviction was based on false evidence.

22 (y) Ground twenty-five. .... 159  
23 The prosecution failed to disclose to Petitioner in violation of *Brady v. Maryland*, et al. the  
24 relationship between Duran Bailey and law enforcement.

25 (z) Ground twenty-six. .... 160  
26 The prosecution failed to disclose to Petitioner in violation of *Brady v. Maryland*, et al. that  
27 there is no such person as Daniel Martinez with Social Security Number 3\*\*-0\*-0\*\*\*, and  
28 Detective Thomas Thowsen perjuringly testified he ran a criminal background check on  
that non-existent person and he had a clean criminal record.

(aa) Ground twenty-seven..... 163  
Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to investigate Diann Parker’s Mexican friends at the  
Grand View Apartments as Duran Bailey’s killers.

(bb) Ground twenty-eight. .... 167  
Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to investigate seven unique handwritten telephone  
numbers that were found in Duran Bailey’s pant’s pockets that could have resulted in  
discovery of Bailey’s killer, exculpatory witnesses or other exculpatory evidence.

1 (cc) Ground twenty-nine ..... 169  
 2     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to subpoena Duran Bailey’s Nevada State Bank  
 3     checking account records for July 2001, including one check processed on July 12, 2001,  
 4     and two checks processed on July 13, 2001, that were likely negotiated by Bailey’s killer.

4 (dd) Ground thirty ..... 172  
 5     Petitioner’s counsel failed to obtain a court order for testing of Diann Parker’s DNA to support  
 6     the Petitioner's third-party culprit defense that her Mexican friends murdered Bailey.

6 (ee) Ground thirty-one ..... 174  
 7     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to investigate and subpoena or obtain a court order  
 8     for records of groin area or penis cutting wounds treated at all Las Vegas area medical care  
 9     facilities during May and June 2001, all reports filed under NRS 629.041 for non-accidental  
 10     knife wounds of a person’s groin area or penis treated at Las Vegas area medical care  
 11     facilities during May and June 2001, and all Las Vegas area police reports involving a  
 12     cutting wound to a person’s groin area or penis during May and June 2001.

11 (ff) Ground thirty-two ..... 176  
 12     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to depose and subpoena LVMPD Detective James  
 13     LaRoche to impeach Detective Thomas Thowsen’s testimony regarding four  
 14     investigations he testified he conducted to try and verify the assault described in the  
 15     Petitioner’s Statement of July 20, 2001, and other matters Thowsen testified about.

15 (gg) Ground thirty-three ..... 178  
 16     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to depose and subpoena LVMPD Detective Thomas  
 17     Thowsen’s secretary to impeach Detective Thomas Thowsen’s regarding a search of NRS  
 18     629.041 reports filed in May, June and July 2001 that he testified he directed her to perform.

18 (hh) Ground thirty-four ..... 179  
 19     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to subpoena the LVMPD manuals, protocols,  
 20     memorandums, and/or regulations homicide detectives are required to follow when  
 21     conducting a homicide investigation, to impeach Detective Thomas Thowsen’s testimony  
 22     regarding four investigations he testified he conducted to try and verify the assault described  
 23     in the Petitioner’s Statement of July 20, 2001, and other matters Thowsen testified about.

22 (ii) Ground thirty-five ..... 181  
 23     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to file motion *in limine* to exclude all testimony  
 24     about Petitioner’s methamphetamine use which ended more than a week prior to Duran  
 25     Bailey’s murder, and to bar conflating Petitioner’s previous methamphetamine use and  
 26     Bailey’s ongoing crack cocaine use under the umbrella of “drugs” and “drug use” because it  
 27     was irrelevant, prejudicial and had no probative value.

26 (jj) Ground thirty-six ..... 183  
 27     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to file discovery request for all discoverable materials.

1 (kk) Ground thirty-seven..... 185  
 2 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to file Motion to Dismiss the NRS 201.450 (sexual  
 3 penetration of a dead body) charge prior to trial on the basis it alleged a non-existent  
 4 violation of the necrophilia law by the Petitioner.

4 (ll) Ground thirty-eight. .... 190  
 5 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to retain a forensic entomologist and introduce  
 6 expert entomology testimony about Duran Bailey’s time of death, which was after sunset on  
 7 July 8, 2001, in Las Vegas, when it is known the Petitioner was 170 miles away in Panaca.

7 (mm) Ground thirty-nine..... 195  
 8 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to retain a psychologist and introduce expert  
 9 testimony the Petitioner’s Statement is not a confession to Bailey’s murder, and that it  
 10 describes a rape assault at a Budget Suites Hotel in east Las Vegas weeks before his murder.

10 (nn) Ground forty..... 199  
 11 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to retain a forensic pathologist and introduce  
 12 exculpatory expert forensic pathology testimony about all facets of the medical evidence  
 13 related to Duran Bailey’s murder to counter the testimony of prosecution expert Medical  
 14 Examiner Lary Simms.

14 (oo) Ground forty-one..... 209  
 15 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to retain forensic scientist and blood pattern expert  
 16 George Schiro, and present his exculpatory testimony about multiple aspects of Duran  
 17 Bailey’s murder.

17 (pp) Ground forty-two..... 216  
 18 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to cross-examine ME Lary Simms about his time of  
 19 death for Duran Bailey that was irreconcilably inconsistent with his preliminary hearing  
 20 testimony that he died within 12 hours of his body’s discovery, which was a period of time  
 21 when the prosecution concedes the Petitioner was not in Las Vegas; and about Simms’  
 22 preliminary hearing testimony that Bailey’s rectum wound was ante-mortem which was  
 23 irreconcilably inconsistent with his trial testimony that it was post-mortem.

21 (qq) Ground forty-three..... 219  
 22 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object that the prosecution did not comply with  
 23 the required statutory notice of expert testimony under NRS 174.234(2) for expert  
 24 testimony by Louise Renhard, Daniel Ford, Thomas Wahl and Kristina Paulette about  
 25 luminol and/or phenolphthalein testing in general, and in particular luminol and/or  
 26 phenolphthalein testing of Petitioner’s personal items and her car.

26 (rr) Ground forty-four. .... 223  
 27 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to introduce into evidence Petitioner’s exculpatory  
 28 black high-heeled platform shoes she was wearing when assaulted at the Budget Suites  
 Hotel that did not have any of Duran Bailey’s blood on them.

1 (ss) Ground forty-five. .... 227  
 2 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially insisted the prosecution introduce into evidence a  
 3 butterfly knife provided by Detective Thomas Thowsen that had no connection to the  
 4 Petitioner, Duran Bailey, or the crime.

5 (tt) Ground forty-six..... 230  
 6 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to properly argue the Petitioner’s alibi witness  
 7 evidence that the attack described in her Statement of July 20, 2001, occurred prior to July  
 8 8, 2001, is trustworthy and admissible under state and federal hearsay exceptions.

9 (uu) Ground forty-seven. .... 234  
 10 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object that the prosecution did not comply with  
 11 the required statutory notice of expert testimony under NRS 174.234(2) for expert  
 12 psychology opinion testimony by Detective Thomas Thowsen that the Petitioner “jumbled”  
 13 details of Bailey’s murder to “minimize” her involvement in the crime.

14 (vv) Ground forty-eight..... 239  
 15 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to make a motion for a mistrial after Detective  
 16 Thomas Thowsen’s declared in response to a juror’s question about what he did at the Budget  
 17 Suites Hotel – “there’s no sense looking for a witness to something that we know didn’t  
 18 happen there. We know it happened on West Flamingo.” – when Thowsen’s declaration was  
 19 not fact but his personal opinion that the Petitioner was a liar in her Statement and guilty of  
 20 Bailey’s murder, and no curative instruction could undo Thowsen’s irreparable prejudice to  
 21 Petitioner’s right to an unbiased and impartial jury, due process of law, and a fair trial.

22 (ww) Ground forty-nine..... 244  
 23 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to make a motion for a mistrial when during Detective  
 24 Thomas Thowsen’s direct testimony ADA William Kephart committed egregious prosecutorial  
 25 misconduct by making as a statement of fact the Petitioner gave Thowsen “her confession” to  
 26 Bailey’s murder, when there was no testimony that she did, and Kephart’s prosecutorial  
 27 misconduct so gravely prejudiced the Petitioner’s rights to an impartial and unbiased jury, due  
 28 process, and a fair trial that no curative instruction could undo the prejudicial effect of Kephart’s  
 false statement, and the appropriate sanction was dismissal of the charges with prejudice.

(xx) Ground fifty..... 246  
 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to use available information to impeach Detective  
 Thomas Thowsen’s testimony about his alleged investigations of the Petitioner’s Statement  
 by allegedly contacting Las Vegas urologists and hospitals, searching for NRS 629.041  
 reports, and going to the Budget Suites Hotel on Boulder Highway.

(yy) Ground fifty-one..... 250  
 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object on confrontation grounds to Detective  
 Thomas Thowsen’s testimony about what he said his secretary told him she did and learned  
 from searching for NRS 629.041 reports about a cutting injury to a groin or penis in May,  
 June and July 2001, and what he said Las Vegas urologists and hospital personal told him  
 they did or did not do or learned regarding a cut or severed penis in May, June and July 2001.

1 (zz) Ground fifty-two.....253  
 2 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object and make a motion for a mistrial and a  
 3 motion for dismissal with prejudice based on: ADA William Kephart’s egregious  
 4 prosecutorial misconduct of suborning perjury from Detective Thomas Thowsen about  
 5 searches of NRS 629.041 reports he did not conduct; perpetrating egregious fraud on the  
 6 court by misrepresenting to Judge Valorie Vega what Thowsen’s direct testimony about the  
 7 NRS 629.041 reports would be, and then committing further fraud on the court by  
 8 misrepresenting to Judge Vega what Thowsen’s direct testimony was to avoid her striking  
 9 his testimony as hearsay; and ADA Sandra DiGiacomo’s prosecutorial misconduct of  
 10 aiding and abetting Kephart in executing his multiple frauds on the court, and if the motion  
 11 for a mistrial was not granted, the failure to object waived the claim on direct appeal.

12 (aaa) Ground fifty-three.....260  
 13 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to use available information during cross-  
 14 examination of Detective Thomas Thowsen to impeach his testimony about what he said  
 15 the Petitioner said about the holding cell she was held in after her arrest.

16 (bbb) Ground fifty-four.....267  
 17 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to question Detective Thomas Thowsen during  
 18 cross-examination about the information about the Petitioner’s sexual assaults as a child  
 19 that he used in a torture like tactic to extract the Petitioner’s waiver of her Miranda rights,  
 20 to determine if he legally obtained the childhood information he used against the Petitioner,  
 21 and if not, the admissibility of the Petitioner’s Statement could have been challenged.

22 (ccc) Ground fifty-five.....269  
 23 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to use available information to impeach Laura  
 24 Johnson’s credibility during her cross-examination.

25 (ddd) Ground fifty-six.....272  
 26 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to investigate or have witnesses testify about the  
 27 area of Las Vegas where methamphetamine was readily bought on the street in June and  
 28 July 2001, and it didn’t include the Nevada State Bank on West Flamingo Road where  
 Duran Bailey was murdered.

(eee) Ground fifty-seven.....274  
 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object on confrontation grounds to Zachory  
 Robinson’s hearsay testimony about the Budget Suites Hotel during May, June and July 2001.

(fff) Ground fifty-eight.....275  
 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to file a pre-trial motion for the disclosure of  
 Detective Thomas Thowsen history of giving false and/or perjurious testimony, his  
 disciplinary record for dishonest and/or unethical conduct during his law enforcement  
 career, and his history of mental health issues.

1 (ggg) Ground fifty-nine.....278  
 2 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to make a NRS 175.381(1) motion for Judge Vega  
 3 to advise the jury to acquit the defendant of all charges at the close of the State’s case, at the  
 4 close of the defense’s case, and after at the State’s rebuttal, on the basis the prosecution did  
 5 not introduce evidence proving beyond a reasonable doubt the essential element that on  
 6 July 8, 2001, the Petitioner was “within Clark County” and at the Nevada State Bank and  
 inside the trash enclosure in its parking lot at the exact time Duran Bailey was murdered, so  
 she could not have committed her accused crimes, and there was insufficient evidence for  
 the jury to find her guilty.

7 (hhh) Ground sixty.....280  
 8 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object to jury instructions 26 and 33 that  
 9 empowered the jury to determine the Petitioner’s “guilt or innocence,” and thus eliminated  
 the Petitioner’s “presumption of innocence,” and eliminated the State’s burden of proof by  
 shifting the burden to the Petitioner to prove she was innocent.

10 (iii) Ground sixty-one. ....282  
 11 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object to jury instruction 31’s “the more weighty  
 12 affairs of life” reasonable doubt standard that allowed the jury to find her guilty by  
 13 calculating odds like the jurors would do if they were playing a game of craps, or poker or  
 14 blackjack in a Las Vegas casino, and the prejudice of instruction 31 was compounded by  
 15 jury instructions 26 and 33 that empowered the jury to determine the Petitioner’s “guilt or  
 16 innocence,” and thus eliminated the Petitioner’s “presumption of innocence,” and  
 eliminated the State’s burden of proof by shifting the burden to the Petitioner to prove she  
 was innocent.

17 (jjj) Ground sixty-two. ....285  
 18 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to submit NRS 201.450 (“sexual penetration of a  
 dead body”) jury instruction that properly stated the law.

19 (kkk) Ground sixty-three.....291  
 20 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object to NRS 201.450 (“sexual penetration of a  
 21 dead body”) jury instruction that did not properly state the law and permitted the jury to  
 convict the Petitioner of a non-existent violation of the necrophilia law.

22 (III) Ground sixty-four.....297  
 23 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to explain to the jury that the prosecution had not  
 24 proved each essential element of each charge, because evidence beyond a reasonable doubt was  
 25 not introduced that the Petitioner was anywhere within Clark County at any time on July 8,  
 2001, the day Duran Bailey was murdered in Las Vegas, and therefore they must acquit her.

26 (mmm) Ground sixty-five. ....299  
 27 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object during the prosecution’s opening statement  
 28 to a multitude of false claims of what would be proven by witnesses that Petitioner’s counsel  
 knew would not be proved during the trial.



1 (nnn) Ground sixty-six..... 300  
 2     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object to prosecution’s closing and rebuttal  
 3     arguments that Duran Bailey’s skull was fractured at the same time as his external injuries,  
 4     when ME Lary Simms testified it was contemporaneous with Bailey’s brain swelling that  
 5     began at least two hours before death, which meant Bailey was subjected to two separate  
 6     attacks in the last hours of his life.

7 (ooo) Ground sixty-seven. .... 303  
 8     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object and make a motion for a mistrial when  
 9     during ADA William Kephart’s rebuttal argument he committed egregious and irreparable  
 10     prosecutorial misconduct by telling the jury he personally believes the Petitioner is guilty  
 11     and the jurors should follow his lead and mark their ballots to convict her as he did: “it’s  
 12     time for you to mark it as I did, guilty of first degree murder with the use of a deadly  
 13     weapon, and guilty of sexual penetration of a dead human body.”, and if the motion for a  
 14     mistrial was not granted, the failure to object waived the claim on direct appeal.

15 (ppp) Ground sixty-eight..... 304  
 16     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object during the prosecution’s closing and  
 17     rebuttal arguments that prejudicially smeared and disparaged the credibility and truthfulness  
 18     of defense alibi witnesses John Kraft, Larry Lobato, and Ashley Lobato because they had  
 19     not been called to testify by the Petitioner’s counsel during her first trial.

20 (qqq) Ground sixty-nine..... 306  
 21     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object and make a motion for a mistrial when ADA  
 22     Sandra DiGiacomo and ADA William Kephart committed egregious and irreparable  
 23     prosecutorial misconduct during closing and rebuttal arguments, respectively, by declaring the  
 24     Petitioner said she had blood on her, her clothes were bloody and that she got in her car bloody,  
 25     when there was no evidence introduced at trial supporting those fatally prejudicial claims, and if  
 26     the motion for a mistrial was not granted, the failure to object waived the claim on direct appeal.

27 (rrr) Ground seventy. .... 309  
 28     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to object and make a motion for a mistrial based on  
 29     the egregious and irreparable egregious prosecutorial misconduct of more than 250 false,  
 30     fabricated, and/or improper prosecution statements during closing and rebuttal arguments  
 31     that were used as a substitute for evidence of the Petitioner’s guilty the prosecution did not  
 32     introduce during the trial, and if the motion for a mistrial was not granted, the failure to  
 33     object waived claims on direct appeal based on the prosecution’s closing and rebuttal  
 34     arguments – including gross prejudicial prosecutorial misconduct, and if the motion for a  
 35     mistrial was not granted, the failure to object waived the claim on direct appeal.

36 (sss) Ground seventy-one..... 319  
 37     Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to retain a dental expert and introduce exculpatory  
 38     expert dental testimony that Bailey’s teeth were not knocked out by a baseball bat.

1 (ttt) Ground seventy-two..... 322  
 2 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to make a NRS 175.381(2) motion for a judgment of  
 3 acquittal within 7 days after the jury’s verdict on the basis the prosecution did not introduce  
 4 evidence proving beyond a reasonable doubt the essential element that the Petitioner was  
 5 “within Clark County” and at the Nevada State Bank and inside the trash enclosure in its  
 6 parking lot at the exact time Bailey was murdered, so she could not have committed her  
 7 accused crimes, and there was insufficient evidence for the jury to find her guilty.

8 (uuu) Ground seventy-three. .... 324  
 9 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to file a post-verdict motion for DNA testing of crime  
 10 scene evidence, including Duran Bailey’s penis and rectum swabs, by new DNA testing  
 11 techniques developed after the Petitioner’s conviction and prior to the Nevada Supreme Court’s  
 12 ruling on her direct appeal, and those tests could scientifically identify Bailey’s killer and  
 13 provide invaluable new exculpatory evidence supporting vacating the Petitioner’s convictions.

14 (vvv) Ground seventy-four. .... 329  
 15 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to brief and argue in her Nevada Supreme Court  
 16 direct appeal “insufficiency of the evidence” claim that her conviction was based on an  
 17 inverted pyramid of speculation by the prosecution, and from that point speculative  
 18 inferences were piled on speculative inferences upon which additional speculative  
 19 inferences were piled, and that was used by the prosecution as a substitute for actual  
 20 evidence the Petitioner was in Clark County on July 8, 2001, and that she murdered Bailey.

21 (www) Ground seventy-five ..... 340  
 22 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to brief and argue in her Nevada Supreme Court direct  
 23 appeal claim that the Petitioner’s “statements to detectives on July 20, 2001, were not voluntary  
 24 and should have been suppressed from use as evidence,” that Judge Vega abused her discretion  
 25 by misapplying the “law of the case” doctrine in admitting the Petitioner’s Statements.

26 (xxx) Ground seventy-six. .... 346  
 27 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to include as argument in the “Petition For Rehearing”  
 28 and the “Petition For Reconsideration En Banc” that the NSC’s ruling was based on two false  
 assumptions, when the truth is there is no evidence the Petitioner’s Statement is an admission of  
 guilt to Duran Bailey’s murder and the post-mortem cutting of his rectum, and there were no  
 positive luminol or phenolphthalein tests for blood in the Petitioner’s car.

(yyy) Ground seventy-seven..... 353  
 Cumulative prejudicial errors by Petitioner’s trial and appellate counsel supports vacating  
 the Petitioner’s conviction and dismissal of the charges with prejudice or a new trial.

(zzz) Ground seventy-eight..... 353  
 Cumulative new exculpatory evidence supports vacating the Petitioner’s conviction and  
 dismissal of the charges with prejudice or a new trial.

(aaaa) Ground seventy-nine. .... 354  
 Petitioner’s counsel prejudicially failed to diligently represent her prior to, during, or after trial.