

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CRAIG MICHAEL TITUS,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 60297

**FILED**

SEP 12 2012

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *R. Malone*  
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying a petition for a writ of prohibition.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Kathleen E. Delaney, Judge.


In his petition filed on December 7, 2011, appellant argued that the State improperly amended the indictment to increase the degree of arson from third degree to first degree. Appellant also appeared to claim that the district court failed to find that his guilty plea to all three counts was freely and voluntarily entered. Based upon our review of the record on appeal, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying the petition. A petition for a writ of prohibition is the improper vehicle to


---


<sup>1</sup>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 Lockett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

challenge the validity of the judgment of conviction. NRS 34.320; NRS 34.330; NRS 34.724(2)(b). Accordingly, we

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Douglas

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Kathleen E. Delaney, District Judge  
Craig Michael Titus  
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 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.