


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRANDEN JAIMES,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 63237

FILED

JAN 16 2014

TRACEE R. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
Clerk

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying a motion for modification of sentence.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Jennifer P. Togliatti, Judge.


In his motion filed on April 9, 2013, appellant claimed that his presentence investigation report contained material errors. Appellant failed to identify what those errors were and thus to demonstrate that the district court relied on mistaken assumptions regarding his criminal record that worked to his extreme detriment. *See Edwards v. State*, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Appellant's remaining claim that the district court failed to elaborate on the sentencing factors provided in NRS 193.165(1) fell outside the narrow scope of claims permissible in a


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).

motion to modify a sentence, *see id.*, and we decline to consider it on the merits. Accordingly, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying appellant's motion, and we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.²


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Cherry

cc: Hon. Jennifer P. Togliatti, District Judge
Branden Jaimes
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
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.