

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAMES GOODALL A/K/A JAMES O.
GOODALL, JR.,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 45274

FILED

JAN 23 2006

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

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

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction, pursuant to a guilty plea, of one count of burglary and adjudication as a habitual criminal. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Stewart L. Bell, Judge. The district court sentenced appellant James Goodall to a prison sentence of 5-20 years. Goodall contends that the sentence constitutes cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the United States and Nevada constitutions because the sentence is disproportionate to the crime.¹ We disagree.

The Eighth Amendment does not require strict proportionality between crime and sentence, but forbids only an extreme sentence that is grossly disproportionate to the crime.² Regardless of its severity, a sentence that is within the statutory limits is not "cruel and unusual punishment unless the statute fixing punishment is unconstitutional or

¹Appellant primarily relies on Solem v. Helm, 463 U.S. 277 (1983).

²Harmelin v. Michigan, 501 U.S. 957, 1000-01 (1991) (plurality opinion).

the sentence is so unreasonably disproportionate to the offense as to shock the conscience."³

This court has consistently afforded the district court wide discretion in its sentencing decision.⁴ This court will refrain from interfering with the sentence imposed "[s]o long as the record does not demonstrate prejudice resulting from consideration of information or accusations founded on facts supported only by impalpable or highly suspect evidence."⁵

In the instant case, Goodall does not allege that the district court relied on impalpable or highly suspect evidence or that the relevant statutes are unconstitutional. Further, we note that the sentence imposed was within the parameters provided by the relevant statutes.⁶ Finally, Goodall received the benefit of a concurrent sentence, dismissal of another charge against him and being charged under the "small" habitual criminal statute, which were the exact terms of the agreement he pleaded guilty to. Accordingly, we conclude that the sentence imposed does not constitute cruel and unusual punishment.

³Blume v. State, 112 Nev. 472, 475, 915 P.2d 282, 284 (1996) (quoting Culverson v. State, 95 Nev. 433, 435, 596 P.2d 220, 221-22 (1979)); see also Glegola v. State, 110 Nev. 344, 348, 871 P.2d 950, 953 (1994).

⁴See Houk v. State, 103 Nev. 659, 747 P.2d 1376 (1987).

⁵Silks v. State, 92 Nev. 91, 94, 545 P.2d 1159, 1161 (1976).

⁶See NRS 205.060; 207.010(1)(a).

Having considered appellant's contention and concluded that it is without merit, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED⁷.

Douglas, J.
Douglas

Becker, J.
Becker

Parraguirre, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Stewart L. Bell, District Judge
Clark County Public Defender Philip J. Kohn
Attorney General George Chanos/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney David J. Roger
Clark County Clerk
James Goodall

⁷Because appellant is represented by counsel in this matter, we decline to grant appellant permission to file documents in proper person in this court. See NRAP 46(b). Accordingly, the clerk of this court shall return to appellant unfiled all proper person documents appellant has submitted to this court in this matter.