

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LEO WALLS,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 58895

FILED

NOV 18 2011

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *A. Ingersoll*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying a motion to correct an illegal sentence.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Valerie Adair, Judge.


In his motion filed on June 15, 2011, appellant claimed that the special sentence of lifetime supervision was illegal because NRS 176.0931 was intended to be imposed only for dangerous sexual offenders and he was not found to be a dangerous sexual offender prior to sentencing, the special sentence of lifetime supervision was disproportionate to the offense in violation of cruel and unusual punishment, NRS 176.0931 violated due process by failing to set forth the dangerous sexual offender limitation in the text of the statute, the special sentence of lifetime supervision is a "second and successive, multiple punishment" in violation of double jeopardy, and the special sentence of lifetime supervision violates equal protection because it targets only sex


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).

offenders and not other types of offenders in violation of the Nevada Constitution's prohibition of "special laws" in Article 4, section 20. Appellant failed to demonstrate that his sentence was facially illegal and that the district court lacked jurisdiction. Edwards v. State, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Notably, NRS 176.0931 does not limit the imposition of lifetime supervision to dangerous sexual offenders. Rather, NRS 176.0931 applies to all defendants who commit a sexual offense as defined by NRS 176.0931(5)(c); the offense of attempted lewdness with a minor under the age of 14 years is just such an offense pursuant to NRS 176.0931(5)(c)(1), (2). We therefore conclude that the district court did not err in denying appellant's motion. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.²


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Parraguirre

²We 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. Valerie Adair, District Judge
Leo Walls
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk