

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FRANK PITTMAN BURNS,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 60408

FILED

OCT 08 2012

GRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *Angela*  
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.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Elissa F. Cadish, Judge.


In his motion filed on January 11, 2012, appellant claimed that NRS 176.0931, requiring imposition of lifetime supervision for certain offenders, was unconstitutional because the legislature set forth no criteria for determining dangerous sexual predators or offenders with a high possibility of recidivism. Appellant further claimed that lifetime supervision violated double jeopardy. 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

---

<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).

(1996). 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.<sup>2</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Saitta

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Pickering

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Hardesty

cc: Hon. Elissa F. Cadish, District Judge  
Frank Pittman Burns  
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.