

**Arizona Supreme Court**  
**Criminal Petition for Review-Post Conviction (ASC)**

**CR-24-0202-PR**

**STATE OF ARIZONA v CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL RUSSO**

**Appellate Case Information**

Case Filed: 8-Aug-2024  
 Case Closed:

**Dept/Composition**

**Side 1. STATE OF ARIZONA, Respondent**

(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA

- State of Arizona

**Attorneys for: Respondent**

Faith Cheree Klepper, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 18444)

**Side 2. CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL RUSSO, Petitioner**

(Litigant Group) CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL RUSSO

- Christopher Michael Russo

PRO SE

**CASE STATUS**

Aug 8, 2024.....Awaiting Petition for Review

Aug 8, 2024.....Pending

PREDECESSOR CASE(S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
1 CA	1 CA-CR 23-0259 PRPC				
↳ MAR	CR2009-007734-001		Pamela S Gates, Judge on PC Comments: (none)		

**2 PROCEEDING ENTRIES**

- 8-Aug-2024 FILED: Motion to Extend Time to File Pro Per Petition for Review (Petitioner Russo, Pro Se)
- 9-Aug-2024 Petitioner Russo filed a "Motion to Extend Time to File Pro Per Petition for Review" on August 8, 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." The motion is non-compliant in these respects. Accordingly,  
  
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) or ARCAP 6(b). This matter is subject to dismissal if a compliant motion or petition for review is not filed by August 23, 2024. (Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk)