

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MARVIN D. PERKINS,
Appellant,
vs.
DIRECTOR, NEVADA DEPARTMENT
OF PRISONS,
Respondent.

No. 57100

FILED

MAR 18 2011

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 post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus, or alternatively, a petition for a writ of mandamus.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Donald M. Mosley, Judge.


In his petition filed on August 2, 2010, appellant claimed that the Department of Corrections failed to correctly compute his statutory good time, work and meritorious credits.² Appellant failed to support his


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).


²To the extent that appellant sought relief by way of a petition for a writ of mandamus, a petition for a writ of mandamus was the wrong vehicle as a post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus is the only remedy available to challenge the computation of time served. NRS 34.724(2)(c).

claim with specific facts, which if true, would have entitled him to relief. Hargrove v. State, 100 Nev. 498, 686 P.2d 222 (1984). Therefore, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³


_____, J.
Saitta


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Donald M. Mosley, District Judge
Marvin D. Perkins
Attorney General/Carson City
Attorney General/Las Vegas
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.