## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANGEL ANN GIARMO, Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent. No. 66832

FILED

MAR 17 2015 CLERK OVSUPREME BOURT BY JULIA DEPUTY CLERK

## ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from an order of the district court denying a post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Valorie J. Vega, Judge.

In her petition filed on March 27, 2013, appellant claimed that the district court and counsel misled her about the sentence she would receive and counsel was ineffective at the time of the guilty plea. Appellant failed to support these claims with specific facts that, if true, would entitle her to relief. *See Hargrove v. State*, 100 Nev. 498, 502-03; 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984). Therefore, the district court did not err in denying these claims.

Appellant also claimed that she was sentenced based on an incorrect presentence investigation report. This claim fell outside the scope of claims available to be raised in a post-conviction petition for a

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEVADA



<sup>&</sup>lt;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 Luckett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

writ of habeas corpus based on a guilty plea. NRS 34.810(1)(a). Therefore, the district court did not err in denying this claim, and we ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>2</sup>

C.J.

Gibbons

J. Tao

ilner J. Silver

cc: Eighth Judicial District Court, Dept. 2 Angel Ann Giarmo Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

<sup>2</sup>We 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.

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEVADA