

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CARLOS ORTIZ-MORALES,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 63877

FILED

NOV 13 2013

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY R. Malone
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


This is a proper person appeal from an amended judgment of conviction.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; David B. Barker, Judge.


On August 1, 2013, the district court amended the judgment of conviction to provide appellant with additional presentence credits for a total of 1,322 days of presentence credit. Appellant filed a proper person notice of appeal from the amended judgment of conviction. Having reviewed the record on appeal, we conclude that the district court did not


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).

err in determining that appellant's presentence credits should have been increased.² Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Saitta

cc: Hon. David B. Barker, District Judge
Carlos Ortiz-Morales
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

²We deny appellant's request for the appointment of counsel as the amended judgment of conviction dealt solely with the credits sought in appellant's proper person motion for additional presentence credits. Contrary to appellant's belief, the amended judgment of conviction does not provide him an opportunity to litigate a direct appeal anew.