

Cite as 2011 Ark. 161

SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

No. CR 11-222

WILLIOUS E. BLOCK,
APPELLANT,

VS.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
APPELLEE,**Opinion Delivered April 14, 2011**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI TO COMPLETE THE
RECORD AND TO STAY BRIEFING,PETITION FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI MOOT; REQUEST
TO STAY BRIEFING DENIED.**PER CURIAM**

Appellant Willious E. Block, by and through his attorney, F. Parker Jones, requests a writ of certiorari to complete the record and to stay briefing. On February 28, 2011, a record was lodged in support of appellant's appeal of the denial of his Rule 37 petition. By letter dated March 3, 2011, Mr. Jones requested that the clerk of the Hempstead County Circuit Court complete the record by forwarding a certified copy of the court of appeals's mandate affirming appellant's conviction and appellant's original Rule 37 petition to our clerk's office. On March 29, 2011, Mr. Jones filed a petition for writ of certiorari, asserting that the circuit clerk failed to comply with his request. In fact, the two certified documents were forwarded to our clerk's office and were file-marked on March 4, 2011, the day following Mr. Jones's request.

It is the attorney's responsibility to remain apprised of the status of his case, which includes knowing the contents of the court's docket as well as what documents have or have

Cite as 2011 Ark. 161

not been filed regarding the case. *See Arkco Corp. v. Askew*, 360 Ark. 222, 200 S.W.3d 444 (2004); *see also Stewart v. State*, 293 Ark. 262, 737 S.W.2d 161 (1987) (per curiam).

Because the court of appeals's mandate and appellant's original Rule 37 petition were forwarded to our clerk's office prior to appellant's petition for writ of certiorari, the petition is moot. In his petition, Mr. Jones also requests a stay of the briefing schedule. As counsel's failure to keep up with the status of his case is the cause of any delay in briefing, his request to stay briefing is denied.

Petition for writ of certiorari moot; request to stay briefing denied.