

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

THOMAS PATRICK SORENSON,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 54580

FILED

MAY 06 2010

FRANCIS K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's May 21, 2009, post-conviction petition for writ of habeas corpus.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Kenneth C. Cory, Judge.

Appellant claimed that his trial counsel was ineffective for failing to protect appellant's rights or to ensure supporting records were correct. Appellant failed to provide any factual support for these claims, and there is no support for them in the record. See Hargrove v. State, 100 Nev. 498, 502, 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984) (holding that "bare" or "naked" claims are insufficient to grant relief). We therefore conclude the district court did not err in denying those claims.

Appellant's remaining claims—that the district attorney violated the plea agreement and failed to follow proper courtroom

---

<sup>1</sup>This appeal has been submitted for decision without oral argument, NRAP 34(f)(3), and we conclude that the record is sufficient for our review and briefing is unwarranted. See Lockett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

procedures and that the presentence investigation report erroneously reported a misdemeanor as a felony—were outside the scope of claims permissible in a post-conviction petition for writ of habeas corpus challenging a judgment of conviction based on a guilty plea. See NRS 34.810(1)(a). We therefore conclude the district court did not err in denying those claims. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>2</sup>

Hardesty, J.  
Hardesty

Douglas, J.  
Douglas

Pickering, J.  
Pickering

cc: Hon. Kenneth C. Cory, District Judge  
Thomas Patrick Sorenson  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>2</sup>We 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.