

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GEORGE MELVIN JEFFERSON,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 64142

FILED

APR 10 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 for a writ of habeas corpus.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Stefany Miley, Judge.

Appellant filed his petition on June 7, 2013, more than one year after entry of the judgment of conviction on November 30, 2011.² Thus, appellant's petition was untimely filed and procedurally barred absent a demonstration of good cause—cause for the delay and undue prejudice. *See* NRS 34.726(1).

Appellant claimed that the procedural bars did not apply because the district court did not have jurisdiction to convict him as the laws reproduced in the Nevada Revised Statutes did not contain an enacting clause as required by the Nevada Constitution. Nev. Const. art.


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).


²No direct appeal was taken.

4, § 23. Appellant's claim was without merit. Appellant's claim did not implicate the jurisdiction of the courts. Nev. Const. art. 6, § 6; NRS 171.010. Moreover, the Statutes of Nevada contain the laws with the enacting clauses required by the constitution. The Nevada Revised Statutes reproduce those laws as classified, codified, and annotated by the Legislative Counsel. NRS 220.120. Therefore, the district court did not err in denying the petition as procedurally barred. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³


_____, J.
Pickering


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Saitta

cc: Hon. Stefany Miley, District Judge
George Melvin Jefferson
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

³We 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.