

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROCHALONN M. CHAPMAN,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 64605

FILED

JUL 22 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 motion to modify or correct an illegal sentence.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Stefany Miley, Judge.

In her motion filed on October 11, 2013, appellant claimed that her deadly weapon enhancement should have been imposed in accordance with the 2007 amendments to NRS 193.165. Appellant failed to demonstrate that the district court relied on mistaken assumptions regarding her criminal record that worked to her extreme detriment. *See Edwards v. State*, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Appellant failed to demonstrate that her sentence was facially illegal² or that the


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).


²Appellant was not entitled to the application of the 2007 amendments to NRS 193.165, because she committed the offense at issue in 2006, before the amendments became effective. *See State v. Second Judicial Dist. Court (Pullin)*, 124 Nev. 564, 567, 188 P.3d 1079, 1081 (2008).

district court lacked jurisdiction. *See id.* Therefore, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying appellant's motion. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³


_____, J.
Pickering


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Saitta

cc: Hon. Stefany Miley, District Judge
Rochalonn M. Chapman
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.