

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KYLE WARNER TURPIN,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 64112

**FILED**

**MAR 11 2014**

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. Young  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying a post-conviction petition requesting genetic marker analysis.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Jessie Elizabeth Walsh, Judge.

In his petition filed on June 7, 2013, appellant requested genetic marker analysis for items of clothing worn by a victim in this case, which appellant believes would show that appellant had multiple defensive wounds, rather than the single wound the State alleged at trial. Appellant asserted that this evidence would have bolstered his claim that he acted in self-defense. Appellant failed to demonstrate a reasonable possibility that he would not have been prosecuted or convicted had genetic marker analysis of the type he requested been conducted. *See*

---

<sup>1</sup>This 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).

NRS 176.09183(1)(a). Therefore, the district court did not err in denying the petition. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>2</sup>

*J. Hardesty*, J.  
Hardesty

*Douglas*, J.  
Douglas

*Cherry*, J.  
Cherry

cc: Hon. Jessie Elizabeth Walsh, District Judge  
Kyle Warner Turpin  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>2</sup>We 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.