IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SHANNON SIMMONS, Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent.

No. 55231

FILED

JUL 1 5 2010

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying a post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; David Wall, Judge.

In his petition, appellant challenged the computation of time served.² Having reviewed the record on appeal, we conclude that substantial evidence supports the decision of the district court to deny relief and that the district court did not err as a matter of law. Riley v.

²We note that the petition was not included in the record on appeal. However, the petition was contained in the district court's files as an attachment to a setting document and transmitted to this court for review. We remind the clerk of the district court of the duty to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus with those documents that comprise the record on appeal.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

¹This 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 <u>Luckett v. Warden</u>, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

State, 110 Nev. 638, 647, 878 P.2d 272, 278 (1994). For the reasons stated in the attached district court order, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.3

Hardesty

toughs, i

Douglas

Pickering

J.

cc: Hon. David Wall, District Judge Shannon Simmons Attorney General/Carson City Attorney General/Las Vegas Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

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.

ORIGINAL

1 **ORDR** CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO 2 **Attorney General** JAMIE J. RESCH 3 Senior Deputy Attorney General Nevada Bar No. 7154 4 Office of the Attorney General 555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101-1068 P: (702) 486-3783 6 F: (702) 486-2377 e-mail: jresch@ag.nv.gov 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff THE STATE OF NEVADA 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 10 SHANNON SIMMONS. Case No.: C247871 11 Petitioner, Dept. No.: 12 ٧. 555 E. Washington, Suite 3900 Las Vegas, NV 89101 13 DWIGHT NEVEN, Warden, et. al., 14 Respondents. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

FILED

7 41 AH 110

XX

Date of Hearing: Dec. 16, 2009 Time of Hearing: 8:30 a.m.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST CONVICTION)

THIS CAUSE having come on for hearing before the Honorable DAVID T. WALL, District Court Judge, on the 13th day of December, 2009, the Petitioner not being present, in proper person, and the Respondents represented by CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO, Attorney General for the State of Nevada, by and through Jamie J. Resch, Senior Deputy Attorney General, and the Court having considered the matter, including briefs, transcripts, arguments of counsel, and all pleadings and documents on file herein, now, therefore, the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

111 111 111

25

2:2

Attorney General's Office

27 111 23 111

-1-

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Simmons is currently an inmate at High Desert State Prison. On August 17, 2008, Simmons was arrested pursuant to a warrant which alleged Count I Attempt Murder with use of a Deadly Weapon, Count 2 and 3 Coercion, Count 4 Battery with use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm, and Count 5 Child Abuse and Neglect. A plea deal was eventually reached and on April 8, 2009, Simmons was sentenced to 30 to 96 months in prison on the charge of Battery with use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.
- 2. Simmons was given 258 days credit for time served. On or about September 30, 2009, Simmons filed the instant Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction). Simmons contends that under NRS 209.4465, he is allowed 20 days of good time per month and 10 days of work time per month towards his sentence, including an allowance of said time for the time Simmons spent in pre-trial detention.
- 3. Simmons has failed to state with any specificity what errors he believes have been committed by the Department of Corrections, and does not identify what he believes the proper calculations to be. In response to the petition, Department of Corrections timekeeping records were submitted and indicate Simmons's sentence is in compliance with NRS 209.4465.
- 4. The Court finds Simmons has alleged insufficient facts to support his claims, NRS 34.735. Simmons's claims amount to nothing more than unsubstantiated conclusions which are belied by the record and fail as a matter of law. Simmons has received all presentence credits to which he is entitled.
- 5. Simmons's claims are baseless and amounted to nothing more than bare naked allegations. Hargrove v. State, 100 Nev. 498, 686 P.2d 222 (1984).
- 6. The Court finds Simmons's petition is without merit and that an evidentiary hearing is not required.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. NRS 209.4465 prescribes the method under which meritorious credits are computed for offenders sentenced to prison from crimes committed after July 17, 1997. An offender may earn up to twenty days of "good time" credit per month, and ten days of "employment/study" time per month, above and beyond the day-for-day credit an inmate receives by being incarcerated.
- 2. "Offender" is defined as "Any person convicted of a crime under the laws of this State and sentenced to imprisonment in the state prison." NRS 209.081.
- 3. As such, the plain reading of NRS 209.4465 makes clear there is no statutory basis for inmates of the Department of Corrections to receive good time or work time credits for time spent in custody prior to being sentenced. See also Kuykendall v. State, 112 Nev. 1285, 1287, 926 P.2d 781 (1996).
- 4. Nonetheless, the records of the Department of Corrections further confirm Simmons has received all pre-conviction credit for time served to which he is entitled.
- 5. Pursuant to NRS 34.770(1), the Court, upon review of the return, answer, and all supporting documents which are filed, shall determine whether an evidentiary hearing is required. The Nevada Supreme Court in <u>Hargrove v. State</u>, 100 Nev. 498, 686 P.2d 222 (1984), held that to the extent a petitioner advances merely "naked" allegations, he is not entitled to an evidentiary hearing.
- 6. Furthermore, NRS 34.770 provides that if the reviewing court determines that a petitioner is not entitled to relief and an evidentiary hearing is not required, the court shall dismiss the petition without a hearing. An evidentiary hearing is not necessary in the instant case as all of Simmons's claims are conclusory, fail as a matter of law, and are belied by the record. As such, Simmons's petition for post conviction relief should be denied.

26 1///

27 11/1/

28 11.1/

ORDER

Based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained herein:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Petition for Post-Conviction Relief shall be, and it is, hereby **DENIED**.

Submitted By:

CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO Attorney General

By:

JAMIE J. RESCH Senior Deputy Attorney General Criminal Justice Division

Attorney General's Office 555 E. Washington, Suize 1900 Las Vegas, NV 89101