

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KEITH R. CURRIE,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 66597

**FILED**

**MAR 17 2015**

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

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

This is an appeal from an order of the district court denying a motion to modify sentence.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; David B. Barker, Judge.

In his motion filed on July 28, 2014, appellant claimed that he was entitled to additional presentence credits. Appellant's claim fell outside the narrow scope of claims permissible in a motion to modify sentence. *See Edwards v. State*, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Therefore, without considering the merits of any of the claims raised in the motion, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying the motion.


In addition, as a separate and independent ground for denying relief, the Nevada Supreme Court has already considered and rejected appellant's assertion that he was entitled to additional presentence


---

<sup>1</sup>This 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).

credits. *Currie v. State*, Docket No. 54795 (Order of Affirmance, July 15, 2010). The doctrine of law of the case prevents further litigation of this claim 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). Therefore, the district court did not err in denying the motion. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>2</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Tao

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Silver

cc: Hon. David B. Barker, District Judge  
Keith R. Currie  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>2</sup>We have reviewed all documents that appellant has submitted 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.