

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ARNOLD KEITH ANDERSON,
Appellant,
vs.
REX REED, DIRECTOR; DEBBIE
ROYER; AND JACK PALMER,
WARDEN,
Respondents.

No. 57762

FILED

SEP 14 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.¹ First Judicial District Court, Carson City; James E. Wilson, Judge.


In his petition, filed on February 3, 2011, appellant first claimed that the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) was improperly computing his sentence. Appellant failed to support this claim with specific facts that, if true, would have entitled him to relief. See Hargrove v. State, 100 Nev. 498, 502, 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984) (holding that "bare" or "naked" claims are insufficient to grant relief). Appellant also claimed that NDOC improperly refused to place him in a minimum security facility. Placement is a condition of confinement and thus may not be challenged in a post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus.


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).

Bowen v. Warden, 100 Nev. 489, 686 P.2d 250 (1984). We therefore conclude that the district court did not err in denying appellant's petition.² Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. James E. Wilson, District Judge
Arnold Keith Anderson
Attorney General/Carson City
Carson City Clerk

²The district court erred in denying the petition on the grounds that it failed to challenge the validity of the judgment of conviction, sentence, or computation of time served. See NRS 34.720. We nevertheless affirm the district court's decision for the reasons stated above. See Wyatt v. State, 86 Nev. 294, 298, 468 P.2d 338, 341 (1970) (holding that a correct result will not be reversed simply because it is based on the wrong reason).

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.