

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TADARYL WILLIAMS,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 57987

TADARYL WILLIAMS,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 58555

**FILED**

SEP 14 2011

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *H. Anger*  
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

These are proper person appeals from orders of the district court denying motions to correct an illegal sentence. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Valerie Adair, Judge.<sup>1</sup> We elect to consolidate these appeals for disposition. NRAP 3(b).

<sup>1</sup>These appeals have 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).

Docket 57987

In his motion filed on January 10, 2011, appellant claimed that his presentence investigation report wrongly stated that he had a prior conviction for homicide. Appellant's claim fell outside the narrow scope of claims permissible in a motion to correct an illegal sentence, as appellant failed to demonstrate that his sentence was facially illegal or that the district court lacked jurisdiction. See Edwards v. State, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Even interpreting appellant's motion as a motion to modify, appellant failed to demonstrate that the district court relied on mistaken assumptions regarding his criminal record that worked to his extreme detriment. See id. Appellant brought this error to the attention of the district court at sentencing, and the State acknowledged that appellant had not been convicted of homicide. We therefore conclude that the district court did not err in denying appellant's motion.

Docket 58555

In his motion filed on May 5, 2011, appellant claimed that he was deprived of his right to counsel at trial and at sentencing. Appellant's claims fell outside the narrow scope of claims permissible in a motion to correct an illegal sentence. Appellant failed to demonstrate that his sentence was facially illegal or that the district court lacked jurisdiction. See id. Therefore, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying appellant's motion. Accordingly, we

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

Douglas, J.  
Douglas

Hardesty, J.  
Hardesty

Parraguirre, J.  
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Valerie Adair, District Judge  
Tadaryl Williams  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>2</sup>We have reviewed all documents that appellant has submitted in proper person to the clerk of this court in these matters, 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.