IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRICK P. HOUSTON, JR. A/K/A BRICK POMMEROY HOUSTON A/K/A BRICK	No. 47136
POMEROY HOUSTON,	
Appellant,	
VS.	
THE STATE OF NEVADA,	
Respondent.	
BRICK POMMEROY HOUSTON A/K/A	No. 47508
BRICK POMEROY HOUSTON,	
Appellant,	
vs.	FILED
THE STATE OF NEVADA,	
Respondent.	JUL 2 8 2006
	MANERTE M. BLOOM

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

C FRK

06-15696

Docket No. 47136 is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court dismissing appellant's post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Docket No. 47508 is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's motion to correct an illegal sentence. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Stewart L. Bell, Judge. We elect to consolidate these appeals for disposition.¹

On April 14, 2004, the district court convicted appellant, pursuant to a guilty plea, of grand larceny. The district court sentenced

¹See NRAP 3(b).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA appellant to serve a term of twenty-four to sixty months in the Nevada State Prison. Appellant voluntarily dismissed his direct appeal.² Docket No. 47136

On January 23, 2006, appellant filed a proper person postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the district court. The State opposed the petition. Pursuant to NRS 34.750 and 34.770, the district court declined to appoint counsel to represent appellant or to conduct an evidentiary hearing. On March 24, 2006, the district court dismissed appellant's petition. This appeal followed.

Appellant filed his petition for a writ of habeas corpus more than one year after this court's order dismissing his direct appeal. Thus, appellant's petition was untimely filed.³ Appellant's petition was procedurally barred absent a demonstration of good cause for the delay and prejudice.⁴

In an attempt to demonstrate good cause for the delay, appellant argued that his appellate counsel promised to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on appellant's behalf and then failed to do so. Because appellant did not have the right to post-conviction counsel, counsel's ineffectiveness did not constitute good cause for appellant's filing

²<u>Houston v. State</u>, Docket No. 43269 (Order Dismissing Appeal, January 20, 2005).

³<u>See</u> NRS 34.726(1).

4<u>See id.</u>

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A 🛥

2

an untimely petition.⁵ Accordingly, we conclude the district court did not err in dismissing appellant's petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

<u>Docket No. 47508</u>

On May 3, 2006, appellant filed a proper person motion to correct an illegal sentence. The State opposed the motion. On May 18, 2006, the district court denied the motion. This appeal followed.

A motion to correct an illegal sentence may only challenge the facial legality of the sentence: either the district court was without jurisdiction to impose a sentence or the sentence was imposed in excess of the statutory maximum.⁶ "A motion to correct an illegal sentence 'presupposes a valid conviction and may not, therefore, be used to challenge alleged errors in proceedings that occur prior to the imposition of sentence."⁷

Our review of the record on appeal reveals that appellant was sentenced within the statutory maximum,⁸ and there is no indication the district court was without jurisdiction to impose sentence in this case. Accordingly, we conclude the district court did not err in denying appellant's motion.

⁵See <u>McKague v. Warden</u>, 112 Nev. 159, 912 P.2d 255 (1996).

⁶Edwards v. State, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996).

⁷<u>Id.</u> (quoting <u>Allen v. United States</u>, 495 A.2d 1145, 1149 (D.C. 1985)).

⁸See NRS 205.220; NRS 205.222.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

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.⁹ Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgments of the district court AFFIRMED.¹⁰

Douglas Douglas J.

J. Parraguirre

J.

cc:

Hon. Stewart L. Bell, District Judge Brick P. Houston Jr. Attorney General George Chanos/Carson City Clark County District Attorney David J. Roger Clark County Clerk

⁹See Luckett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

¹⁰We have reviewed all documents that appellant has submitted in proper person to the clerk of this court in these matters, 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.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA