

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MIGUEL ANGEL RAMIREZ,
Appellant,
vs.
E.K. MCDANIEL, WARDEN,
Respondent.

No. 56178

FILED

SEP 29 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 a petition for a writ of habeas corpus.¹ Seventh Judicial District Court, White Pine County; Dan L. Papez, Judge.


Based upon our review of the record on appeal, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying the petition. To the extent that appellant sought expungement of his inmate file and challenged the classification proceedings in the prison, his transfer to various institutions, the 2009 parole hearing and the parole score he received in 2009, appellant's claims were not cognizable in a petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed in state court because these claims challenged the conditions of confinement.² Bowen v. Warden, 100 Nev. 489, 686 P.2d 250


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).


²The record does not reveal the loss of any credits. Rather, the record reflects that the 2006 disciplinary infraction was dismissed. Appellant's claim that the 2006 disciplinary infraction affected the
continued on next page . . .

(1984). To the extent that appellant challenged the denial of parole in 2009, appellant's claim was without merit as parole is an act of grace of the state and a prisoner has no right to serve less than the lawfully imposed sentence. See NRS 213.10705; NRS 213.1099(1); Weakland v. Bd. of Parole Comm'rs, 100 Nev. 218, 678 P.2d 1158 (1984) (recognizing that Nevada's parole statutory scheme did not create a constitutionally cognizable liberty interest). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³


_____, J.
Cherry


_____, J.
Saitta


_____, J.
Gibbons

... continued

computation of time in the instant case is based on nothing more than speculation.

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.

cc: Hon. Dan L. Papez, District Judge
White Pine Co. Clerk
Miguel Angel Ramirez
Attorney General/Ely