


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROBERT HOLMES, III,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 64165

**FILED**

**FEB 12 2014**

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

This is a proper person appeal from an amended judgment of conviction.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Jerome T. Tao, Judge.


On September 17, 2013, the district court amended the judgment of conviction to provide appellant with additional presentence credits for a total of 172 days of presentence credit. Appellant filed a proper person notice of appeal from the amended judgment of conviction.


---


<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).

Having reviewed the record on appeal, we conclude that appellant was not entitled to any additional credits.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.

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

 \_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Parraguirre

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

cc: Hon. Jerome T. Tao, District Judge  
Robert Holmes, III  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>2</sup>We 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.