

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MICHAEL JAMES BETTS,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 62579

FILED

JUN 12 2013

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *K. 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 Seventh Judicial District Court, Lincoln County; Dan L. Papez, Judge.


In his motion filed on November 21, 2012, appellant claimed that the district court was without jurisdiction to convict him because the laws reproduced in the Nevada Revised Statutes do not contain enacting clauses as required by the Nevada Constitution. Nev. Const. art. 4, § 23. 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 (1996).


As a separate and independent ground for affirming the district court's order, appellant's claim was without merit as the Statutes of Nevada contain the laws with the enacting clauses required by 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).

Nevada Constitution. The Nevada Revised Statutes reproduce those laws as classified, codified, and annotated by the Legislative Counsel. NRS 220.120. 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


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Cherry

cc: Hon. Gary Fairman, District Judge
Michael James Betts
Attorney General/Carson City
Lincoln County District Attorney
Attorney General/Ely
Lincoln County Clerk

²We 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.