


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RICKY JONES,
Appellant,
vs.
DIRECTOR, NEVADA DEPARTMENT
OF CORRECTIONS, GLEN WHORTON,
Respondent.

No. 47700

FILED

OCT 17 2006

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Joseph T. Bonaventure, Judge.

On April 3, 2006, appellant filed a proper person petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the district court. The State opposed the petition. On June 9, 2006, the district court denied appellant's petition. This appeal followed.

In his petition, appellant challenged the denial of his requests for placement in minimum custody. Based upon our review of the record on appeal, we conclude that the district court did not err in dismissing the petition. Because appellant challenged only the conditions of confinement, appellant's claims were not cognizable in a petition for a writ of habeas corpus.¹ Therefore, we affirm the order of the district court.

¹See Bowen v. Warden, 100 Nev. 489, 490, 686 P.2d 250, 250 (1984) ("We have repeatedly held that a petition for writ of habeas corpus may challenge the validity of current confinement, but not the conditions thereof."); see also Sandin v. Conner, 515 U.S. 472 (1995).

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

Becker, J.
Becker

Hardesty, J.
Hardesty

Parraguirre, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Joseph T. Bonaventure, District Judge
Ricky Jones
Attorney General George Chanos/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney David J. Roger
Clark County Clerk

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.