

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ABDUL HOWARD,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 65826

FILED

MAR 11 2015

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *S. Young*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from an order denying a motion to amend a judgment of conviction.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Douglas Smith, Judge.


In his motion, filed on March 19, 2014, appellant sought to have struck from his judgment of conviction the provision requiring him to register as a sex offender.² This court has previously held that appellant's judgment of conviction did not contain any errors as to the sex offender registration. *See Howard v. State*, Docket No. 57487 (Order of Affirmance, July 13, 2011). This holding is the law of the case and "cannot be avoided by a more detailed and precisely focused argument." *Hall v. State*, 91 Nev. 314, 316, 535 P.2d 797, 799 (1975). To the extent appellant was

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's motion appears to conflate lifetime supervision and sex offender registration, but they are not the same thing. *Compare* NRS 179D.441-179D.550, *with* NRS 213.1243. Appellant's judgment of conviction imposed only sex offender registration, not lifetime supervision.

challenging the validity of his judgment of conviction, the instant motion was the improper vehicle. See NRS 34.724(2)(b). Accordingly, we


ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³



Parraguirre J.



Douglas J.



Cherry J.

cc: Hon. Douglas Smith, District Judge
Abdul Howard
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.