IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LUIS FELIPE VAZQUEZ, JR., Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent. No. 65628

FILED

NOV 12 2014

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction, pursuant to a guilty plea, of burglary. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Douglas Smith, Judge.

Appellant Luis Felipe Vazquez, Jr., contends that the district court abused its discretion by denying his presentence motion to withdraw his guilty plea. Vazquez claims that he received ineffective assistance of counsel, however, he offers no argument or citation to any relevant legal authority in support of his claim; therefore, we decline to address it. See Maresca v. State, 103 Nev. 669, 673, 748 P.2d 3, 6 (1987) ("It is appellant's responsibility to present relevant authority and cogent argument; issues

¹Vazquez also failed to include the transcript of the hearing on his motion in the appendix. See Thomas v. State, 120 Nev. 37, 43 & n.4, 83 P.3d 818, 822 & n.4 (2004) ("Appellant has the ultimate responsibility to provide this court with 'portions of the record essential to determination of issues raised in appellant's appeal." (quoting NRAP 30(b)(3))).

not so presented need not be addressed by this court."). Accordingly, we ORDER the judgment of conviction AFFIRMED.²

Hardestv

__, J.

Douglas

, J.

Cherry

, J.

cc: Hon. Douglas Smith, District Judge Spencer M. Judd Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

²The fast track statement does not comply with the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure because the text in the body of the brief is not double-spaced, see NRAP 3C(h)(1); NRAP 32(a)(4), and the fact section does not contain any citations to the record, see NRAP 3C(e)(1)(C) and NRAP 28(e)(1). Counsel for Vazquez is cautioned that the failure to comply with the briefing requirements in the future may result in the imposition of sanctions. See NRAP 3C(n).