IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF WASHINGTON COUNTY

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

DISTRICT COURT WASHINGTON CO OK
JEAN DAVIS, COURT CLERK
FILED
APR 0 9 2025
BY

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
Plaintiff,

v.

FLYNN ROBERT MARTIN,
Defendant.

Case No. CM-2024-00301

MOTION TO PROCEED PRO SE

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant formally invokes his constitutional right to self-representation pursuant to the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution, as recognized in Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806 (1975), and Article II, § 20 of the Oklahoma Constitution.

Defendant makes this request knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently, fully aware of the responsibilities and consequences of self-representation. This motion is timely and made without intent to delay or disrupt proceedings.

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On August 5, 2024, the Court appointed Kristi Sanders (OIDS) as counsel, explicitly ordering her to initiate contact with Defendant within five (5) business days. Counsel did not comply with this order.

On January 10, 2025, counsel filed a Motion to Dismiss but failed to cite the controlling statute (22 O.S. § 504(4)), creating procedural ambiguity.

At the March 4, 2025, hearing, counsel admitted to the Court she had not reviewed the State's Response to the Motion to Dismiss, causing additional procedural delays.

Throughout these proceedings, Defendant has consistently sought effective communication and participation in his defense. Defendant resides out-of-state (Arizona), and repeated procedural delays have significantly compounded inconvenience, expense, and personal hardship.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

The right to self-representation is established under the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution, articulated in Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806 (1975), and recognized under Article II, § 20 of the Oklahoma Constitution and 22 O.S. § 13.

To proceed pro se, a defendant must demonstrate:
(1) a clear and unequivocal assertion of the right;
(2) a knowing and intelligent waiver of counsel; and
(3) competence to stand trial (legal expertise not required).

IV. BASIS FOR PRO SE REQUEST

A. Request is Clear and Timely

Defendant submits this motion clearly and unequivocally, well before trial, without intent to disrupt or delay the proceedings. Delays to date are attributable to circumstances beyond Defendant's control.

B. Waiver is Knowing and Intelligent

Defendant fully understands the responsibilities, procedural demands, and risks of self-representation. Defendant's prior filings and active participation reflect his preparedness to proceed pro se.

C. Procedural Issues Constituting Good Cause for Termination

Counsel's failure to comply with the Court's August 5, 2024, order requiring timely initial contact, omission of the controlling statute (22 O.S. § 504(4)) in the January 10, 2025, Motion to Dismiss, and lack of preparedness at the March 4, 2025, hearing

constitute good cause to terminate counsel's representation and permit Defendant to proceed pro se.

V. RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Defendant respectfully requests this Court grant the following relief:

1. Leave for Defendant to proceed pro se in all future proceedings;
2. Immediate termination of representation by appointed counsel, Kristi Sanders (OIDS);
3. Direction that all future filings, notices, and communications be directed exclusively to Defendant Flynn Robert Martin;
4. An order requiring prior counsel to immediately provide Defendant with all discovery, case-related documents, and the entire case file currently in counsel's possession or available in the courtroom.

Respectfully submitted,

Flynn Robert Martin
Defendant, Pro Se
4413 E. Whitman St.
Tucson, AZ 85712
flickjones12@gmail.com
520-869-2821

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 9th day of April, 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Proceed Pro Se was delivered to:

Washington County District Attorney's Office

Kristi Sanders (OIDS)



Flynn Robert Martin