

Arizona Supreme Court
Criminal Petition for Review - Special Action

CR-24-0185-PR

GREGERY KEETEN v HON. ADLEMAN/HON. WEIN/STATE

Appellate Case Information

Case Filed: 29-Jul-2024
 Case Closed:

Dept/Composition

Side 1. GREGERY MARTEL KEETEN, Petitioner
 (Litigant Group) GREGERY MARTEL KEETEN

- Gregery Martel Keeten PRO SE Attorneys for: Petitioner

Side 2. HON. JAY R. ADLEMAN and HON. KEVIN B. WEIN, JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, in and for the County of Maricopa, Respondent Judge

(Litigant Group) HON. JAY R. ADLEMAN and HON. KEVIN B. WEIN, JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, in and for the County of Maricopa

- Hon Jay R Adleman, Maricopa County Superior Court
- Hon Kevin B Wein, Maricopa County Superior Court

Side 3. STATE OF ARIZONA, Real Party in Interest

(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA

- State of Arizona Attorneys for: Real Party in Interest
Ann K Logue, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 31137)

CASE STATUS

Jul 29, 2024.....Awaiting Petition for Review Jul 29, 2024.....Pending

PREDECESSOR CASE(S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
1 CA 1 CA-SA 24-0135					
↪ MAR CR2016-149044-001			Jay R Adleman, Authoring Judge of Order Kevin B Wein, Authoring Judge of Order Comments: (none)		

2 PROCEEDING ENTRIES

- 29-Jul-2024 FILED: Motion Re: Respectful Request for an Extension of Time to File Petition for Review of a Special Action Decision of the Court of Appeals, Pursuant to Ariz. R. Crim. P. Rule 31.21 (b)(1) (Petitioner Keeten, Pro Se)
- 30-Jul-2024 Petitioner Keeten filed a "Motion Re: Respectful Request for an Extension of Time to File Petition for Review of a Special Action Decision of the Court of Appeals, Pursuant to Ariz. R. Crim. P. Rule 31.21 (b)(1)" on July 29, 2024. Pursuant to Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, 31.6(e) and Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, Rule 6(b), a motion for a procedural order must include a statement by the moving party of whether the other parties consent to, or object to, the entry of the order that is sought; or why the moving party was unable to contact the other parties before filing the motion, and the caption of a motion for procedural order must include the words, "Motion for Procedural Order." Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED the motion is denied without prejudice to Petitioner's ability to file a motion in compliance with Arizona Rules of Crim. Proc. Rule 31.6(e) and ARCAP 6(b). This matter is subject to dismissal if a compliant motion or petition for review is not filed by August 13, 2024. (Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk)