

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MEGAN CHRISTINE PEDRO,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 67386

FILED

AUG 05 2015

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

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction, pursuant to a guilty plea, of attempted murder. Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; Lidia Stiglich, Judge.

Appellant Megan Pedro claims the district court abused its discretion at sentencing by relying on highly suspect and unsupported evidence when imposing sentence. Specifically, she asserts the district court relied on the State's improper characterization of this case as involving mutilation and torture and the State's improper arguments that she was going to commit a murder-suicide, she was untruthful when she stated she attempted to apply pressure to the wounds to lessen the bleeding, and she tried to "cover her tracks" after she committed the crime. We conclude this claim lacks merit.

The district court has wide discretion in its sentencing decision. *See Houk v. State*, 103 Nev. 659, 664, 747 P.2d 1376, 1379

(1987). We will not interfere with the sentence imposed by the district court “[s]o long as the record does not demonstrate prejudice resulting from consideration of information or accusations founded on facts supported only by impalpable or highly suspect evidence.” *Silks v. State*, 92 Nev. 91, 94, 545 P.2d 1159, 1161 (1976).


Pedro got into an argument with her girlfriend about text messages on her girlfriend’s phone. The argument escalated into an altercation, which ultimately resulted in Pedro taking out her pocket knife and wielding it against her girlfriend. Pedro repeatedly stabbed her girlfriend and slit her girlfriend’s throat, completely severing the neck muscles and jugular vein on one side and partially severing the jugular vein on the other side. The judge sentenced Pedro to a term of 96-240 months in prison, *see* NRS 193.330(1)(a)(1); NRS 200.030, explaining that she was most troubled by Pedro’s continued characterization of the circumstances as an “overreaction.”

The record supports the State’s arguments and characterization of the crime. And the record reflects the district court’s sentencing decision was not affected by any improper argument or mischaracterization. *Randell v. State*, 109 Nev. 5, 7-8, 846 P.2d 278, 280 (1993) (“[J]udges spend much of their professional lives separating the wheat from the chaff and have extensive experience in sentencing, along with the legal training necessary to determine an appropriate sentence.”)

(alteration in original) (quoting *People v. Mockel*, 276 Cal. Rptr. 559, 563 (Ct. App. 1990))). We conclude the district court did not abuse its discretion when imposing sentence. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of conviction AFFIRMED.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Silver

cc: Hon. Lidia Stiglich, District Judge
Washoe County Alternate Public Defender
Attorney General/Carson City
Washoe County District Attorney
Washoe District Court Clerk