


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

WILLIAM HENRY COLLIER, JR.,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 66668

FILED

JAN 21 2015

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


This is an appeal from an order of the district court denying a motion to modify sentence.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Douglas Smith, Judge.


In his motion filed on September 9, 2014, appellant claimed that the district court erred by adjudicating him a habitual criminal because the notice of intent to seek habitual criminal status was not included in the information. 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

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).

conclude that the district court did not err in denying the motion. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.²


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Silver

cc: Hon. Douglas Smith, District Judge
William Henry Collier, Jr.
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

²We have reviewed all documents that appellant has submitted in pro se 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.