

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CLARENCE EUGENE TERRELL, JR.,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 64354

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 appellant's post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; David B. Barker, Judge.

In his April 10, 2013, petition, appellant claimed he was entitled to additional days of credit for time spent in an Arizona jail prior to his transfer to the custody of Nevada officials. Appellant failed to demonstrate that he was entitled to additional credits.

Appellant was serving a term of probation when he absconded from Nevada. Arizona authorities later arrested and convicted appellant of multiple Arizona offenses and appellant was sentenced to a term of confinement in the Coconino County jail. After appellant completed his Arizona sentence, he was transferred to Nevada and the district court


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 *Luckett v. Warden*, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

revoked appellant's probation. Under these circumstances, appellant was not entitled to any additional credit for time served or probationary deductions for his time served in Arizona. See NRS 176.055(2); NRS 176A.500(5). In addition, appellant was not entitled to any statutory credits from the Nevada Department of Corrections for his time served in Arizona. See NRS 209.4465. Therefore, the district court did not err in denying the petition. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.²


_____, J.
Pickering


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Saitta

cc: Hon. David B. Barker, District Judge
Clarence Eugene Terrell, Jr.
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

²We 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.