

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KIMBERLY ROSHAWN MEEKS,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 54528

FILED

FEB 03 2010

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


This is an appeal from a district court order revoking probation and a second amended judgment of conviction. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Elissa Cadish, Judge.


Appellant Kimberly Roshawn Meeks contends that the district court erred by allowing hearsay testimony that was not supported by verified facts and that the evidence was insufficient to support the district court's decision to revoke her probation because the decision was based solely on the hearsay testimony. We disagree. Meeks' own testimony tended to verify the hearsay testimony and was sufficient to "reasonably satisfy the judge" that Meeks' conduct had "not been as good as required by the conditions of probation" and therefore Meeks has not made a clear showing of an abuse of discretion in the admission of the hearsay testimony or the district court's decision to revoke her probation. Lewis v. State, 90 Nev. 436, 438, 529 P.2d 796, 797 (1974); see Anaya v. State, 96 Nev. 119, 123, 125, 606 P.2d 156, 158, 160 (1980) (explaining the due

process balancing standard that governs admissibility of evidence at a probation revocation hearing). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.


_____, J.
Cherry


_____, J.
Saitta


_____, J.
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Elissa Cadish, District Judge
Clark County Public Defender
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk