

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANTHONY TERRELL HAMPTON,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 55413

FILED

JUN 09 2010

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

ORDER OF REVERSAL AND REMAND

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; Michael Villani, Judge.

Appellant filed a timely petition on October 23, 2009. The district court denied the petition without conducting an evidentiary hearing or appointing counsel. We cannot affirm the order of the district court at this time for the reasons discussed below.


NRS 34.750 provides for the discretionary appointment of post-conviction counsel and sets forth the following factors which the court may consider in making its determination to appoint counsel: the petitioner's indigency, the severity of the consequences to the petitioner, the difficulty of those issues presented, whether the petitioner is unable to comprehend the proceedings, and whether counsel is necessary to proceed with discovery. The determination of whether counsel should be


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 Lockett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

appointed is not necessarily dependent upon whether a petitioner raises issues in a petition which, if true, would entitle the petitioner to relief.

Appellant's petition arose out of a jury trial during which he was represented by appointed counsel. Appellant, who is serving a significant sentence, claimed that he was indigent and moved for the appointment of post-conviction counsel. Appellant raised several issues, several of which would require the development of facts outside the record. The failure to appoint post-conviction counsel prevented a meaningful litigation of the petition. We therefore reverse the district court's denial of appellant's petition and remand this matter for the appointment of counsel to assist appellant in the post-conviction proceedings. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court REVERSED AND REMAND this matter to the district court for proceedings consistent with this order.²


_____, J.
Cherry


_____, J.
Saitta


_____, J.
Gibbons

²We have considered all proper person documents filed or received in this matter. We conclude that appellant is only entitled to the relief described herein.

cc: Hon. Michael Villani, District Judge
Anthony Terrell Hampton
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk