

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHRISTOPHER LEE LAMADRID,
Appellant,
vs.
DWIGHT NEVEN, WARDEN; JAMES
COX, DIRECTOR; REX REED,
ADMINISTRATOR; AND THE STATE
OF NEVADA,
Respondents.

No. 60349

FILED

SEP 12 2012

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *T. Malone*
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 Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Kathy A. Hardcastle, Judge.


In his petition filed on October 17, 2011, appellant claimed that the Department of Corrections failed to credit him with 20 days of statutory good time credits for each month served pursuant to the 2007 amendments to NRS 209.4465. 2007 Nev. Stat., ch. 525, § 5, at 3176-77 (NRS 209.4465(1),(8)). Based upon our review of the record on appeal, we conclude that appellant failed to demonstrate that he was entitled to any additional credits as he was not eligible for retroactive application of the


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).

2007 amendatory provisions.² 2007 Nev. Stat., ch. 525, § 21, at 3196.
Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Kathy A. Hardcastle, District Judge
Christopher Lee Lamadrid
Attorney General/Carson City
Attorney General/Las Vegas
Eighth District Court Clerk

²We note that the district court inexplicably cited to NRS 209.449 in resolving this petition. Regardless of the citation error, the district court reached the correct result in denying the petition. See Wyatt v. State, 86 Nev. 294, 298, 468 P.2d 338, 341 (1970)

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.