

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MICHAEL GEORGE ZANFINO,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 60806

**FILED**

NOV 14 2012

TRAGIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *Angela*  
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order denying a motion to vacate, modify or correct sentence.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; J. Charles Thompson, Senior Judge.


In his motion filed on March 29, 2012, appellant claimed that his conviction violated double jeopardy and he received ineffective assistance of counsel in this case and in another district court case. Appellant's claims fell outside the very narrow scope of claims permissible in a motion to modify or correct sentence. See Edwards v. State, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Appellant failed to demonstrate that the district court relied on mistaken assumptions regarding his criminal record that worked to his extreme detriment. See id. Appellant failed to demonstrate that his sentence was facially illegal and that the district


---


<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).

court lacked jurisdiction. See id. 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.  
Douglas

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

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

cc: Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court  
Hon. J. Charles Thompson, Senior Judge  
Michael George Zanfino  
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.