

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DERRICK SCOTT HARTMAN,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 63927

**FILED**

APR 10 2014

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


*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

This is an appeal from a district court order revoking probation. Sixth Judicial District Court, Humboldt County; Michael Montero, Judge.

Appellant Derrick Hartman contends that the record does not demonstrate that he knowingly and intelligently waived his right to confront his accusers at his revocation hearing or that he was adequately informed of the consequences of admitting probation violations. The district court informed Hartman that if he admitted violations he would waive several rights, including the right to confront his accusers, and as a result of such admissions, the court could revoke his probation and order him to serve the underlying sentence. Hartman stated he understood the rights he was waiving and the consequences of admitting probation

violations. Because the claims are belied by the record, we conclude they lack merit, and we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>1</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Pickering

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Parraguirre

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Saitta

cc: Hon. Michael Montero, District Judge  
Humboldt County Public Defender  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Humboldt County District Attorney  
Humboldt County Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>The fast track statement does not comply with the provisions of NRAP 32(a)(4) because it does not have margins of at least one inch on all four sides. See NRAP 3C(h)(1) (requiring fast track filings to comply with the provisions of NRAP 32(a)(4)-(6)). We caution appellant's counsel that future failure to comply with the rules when filing briefs may result in the imposition of sanctions. See NRAP 3C(n).