


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MARVIN D. PERKINS,
Appellant,
vs.
NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS; AND THE STATE OF
NEVADA,
Respondents.

No. 62749

FILED

OCT 16 2013

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
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; Adriana Escobar, Judge.


In his petition filed on June 20, 2011, appellant claimed that his credits were not accurately calculated. The district court denied the petition. This court affirmed the district court's order in part, but reversed the order in part and remanded for further proceedings on the claim for additional credits while on parole. *Perkins v. State*, Docket No. 59783 (Order Affirming in Part, Reversing in Part and Remanding, September 12, 2012). The district court conducted further proceedings and entered an order recognizing a downward adjustment in the amount of credits as a result of the audit. Appellant appeals from that decision.


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 *Luckett v. Warden*, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

Based upon our review of the record on appeal, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying the petition. Appellant failed to demonstrate that he was entitled to any additional credits. NRS 209.443; NRS 209.4475. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.²


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Cherry

cc: Hon. Adriana Escobar, District Judge
Marvin D. Perkins
Attorney General/Las Vegas
Attorney General/Carson City
Eighth District Court 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.