

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LUAN LUANHASA,
Appellant,
vs.
WARDEN, NORTHERN NEVADA
CORRECTIONAL CENTER, DON
HELLING,
Respondent.

No. 44860

FILED

JUL 22 2005

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Richards*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

This is an appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus. First Judicial District Court, Carson City; William A. Maddox, Judge.


On June 8, 2004, appellant filed a post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging the legality of his confinement. The State opposed the petition and appellant filed a reply. On February 18, 2005, the district court denied the petition. This appeal followed.


Appellant raised four claims challenging the legality of his confinement: (1) he is wrongfully incarcerated because he completed all of his sentences; (2) he was falsely arrested and imprisoned as a result of a parole violation; (3) he was illegally extradited to Nevada; and (4) the Division of Parole and Probation wrongfully refused to grant him credit for the time he served in Eloy, AZ, and county jails. Appellant requested his immediate release and discharge from custody. Based on our review of the record on appeal, we conclude that appellant's claims were without merit


and would not entitle appellant to the relief requested.¹ Accordingly, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying the petition.

Having reviewed the record on appeal, and for the reasons set forth above, we conclude that appellant is not entitled to relief and that briefing and oral argument are unwarranted.² Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³


_____, J.
Maupin


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Parraguirre

¹See Hargrove v. State, 100 Nev. 498, 503, 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984); NRS 213.151(1); NRS 209.446(1).

²See Lockett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

³We have reviewed all documents that appellant has submitted in proper person to the clerk of this court in this matter, and we conclude that no relief based upon those submissions is warranted. To the extent that appellant has attempted to present claims or facts in those submissions which were not previously presented in the proceedings below, we have declined to consider them in the first instance.

cc: Hon. William A. Maddox, District Judge
Luan Luanhasa
Attorney General Brian Sandoval/Carson City
Carson City District Attorney
Carson City Clerk