IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ZEL NORMAN,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 59461

FILED

APR 11 2012

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY D. Malone
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; Michael Villani, Judge.

In his motion filed on September 6, 2011, appellant claimed that he was improperly adjudicated a habitual criminal for both counts of possession of a controlled substance and because the State failed to properly provide notice of its intention to seek habitual criminal adjudication. Appellant failed to demonstrate that his sentence was facially illegal and that the district court lacked jurisdiction. See Edwards v. State, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Nothing in NRS 207.010 prevents the district court from adjudicating appellant a habitual criminal for each substantive offense committed. We further note that the State filed a notice of its intention to seek habitual criminal adjudication.

[1]This 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 Luckett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

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]

Cherry, J.
Cherry

Pickering, J.
Pickering

Hardesty, J.
Hardesty

cc: Hon. Michael Villani, District Judge
Zel Norman
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

[2]We 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.