

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CODY C. LEAVITT,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 66325

FILED

JAN 15 2010

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *Tracie K. Lindeman*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

CODY C. LEAVITT,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 66419

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


These are proper person appeals from orders of the district court denying petitions for a writ of mandamus.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Michael Villani, James M. Bixler, Judges.


¹These appeals have been submitted for decision without oral argument, NRAP 34(f)(3), and we conclude that the records are sufficient for our review and briefing is unwarranted. *See Lockett v. Warden*, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975). We grant appellant's motion to consolidate the appeals for disposition.


To the extent that appellant appealed from the denial of motions to correct clerical mistakes, motions for an order directing the clerk to issue a presentence investigation report, and motions for reconsideration, these decisions are not appealable. *See Phelps v. State*, 111 Nev. 1021, 1022-23, 900 P.2d 344, 344-45 (1995); *Castillo v. State*, 106 Nev. 349, 352, 792 P.2d 1133, 1135 (1990). To the extent that appellant appealed from his judgments of conviction, his notice of appeal was untimely filed, and we lack jurisdiction to consider it. NRAP 4(b); *Lozada v. State*, 110 Nev. 349, 352, 871 P.2d 944, 946 (1994).

In his petition filed on March 26, 2014, in district court case number C248756, and his petition filed on March 27, 2014, in district court case number C233866, appellant asked the district court to order the Division of Parole and Probation to correct alleged errors in his presentence investigation report. We conclude that the district court did not err in denying appellant's petitions because the district court has no authority to amend a presentence investigation report after sentencing. See NRS 34.160; *Stockmeier v. State, Bd. of Parole Comm'rs*, 127 Nev. ___, ___, 255 P.3d 209, 213-14 (2011). Therefore, we

ORDER the judgments of the district court AFFIRMED.²


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Cherry

²In light of this disposition, we deny as moot appellant's applications to proceed in forma pauperis, motions for waiver of page limitations, motions to appoint counsel, and motions for production of transcripts at State expense. We have reviewed all documents that appellant has submitted in proper person to the clerk of this court in these matters, 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.

cc: Hon. Michael Villani, District Judge
Hon. James M. Bixler, District Judge
Cody C. Leavitt
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk