

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RONALD LEE LENNON,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 55319

**FILED**

SEP 10 2010

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

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's February 13, 2009, post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Valerie Adair, Judge.

Appellant claimed that trial counsel was ineffective in failing to investigate his case, interview witnesses, or properly challenge the State's witnesses or theory of the case, and he claimed that appellate counsel was ineffective in failing to raise claims of prosecutorial misconduct on appeal. Appellant failed to support these claims with specific facts that, if true, would have entitled him to relief. 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.


---


<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).

Appellant also claimed that counsel has refused to provide him with his case file. As this claim does not challenge his imprisonment or restraint, it is outside the scope of claims permissible in a petition. See NRS 34.360.

For the foregoing reasons, we

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Hardesty

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Douglas

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Pickering

cc: Hon. Valerie Adair, District Judge  
The Eighth District Court Clerk  
Ronald Lee Lennon  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney

---

<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.