IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JUAN RICO DOSS,

No. 36278

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Respondent.

FILED

DEC 18 2001

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY HIEP DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

We have reviewed the record on appeal and for the reasons stated in the attached order of the district court, we conclude that the district court properly denied appellant's petition. Therefore, briefing and oral argument are not warranted in this case.¹ Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.2

Shearing

Becker J

cc: Hon. Donald M. Mosley, District Judge Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Juan Rico Doss Clark County Clerk

¹See Luckett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

²We have considered all proper person documents filed or received in this matter, and we conclude that the relief requested is not warranted.

1	ORDR STEWART L. BELL DISTRICT ATTORNEY Nevada Bar #000477 200 S. Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 (702) 455-4711 Attorney for Plaintiff Attorney for Plaintiff
2	DISTRICT ATTORNEY
3	Nevada Bar #000477 200 S. Third Street 2 45 PM 100
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 (702) 455-4711
5	Attorney for Plaintiff
6	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,
8	Plaintiff,
9	-vs- Case No C160330
10	JUAN RICO DOSS, Dept. No. XIV #1523179 Dept. No. XIV Docket T
11	\[\text{\tinx{\tint{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tint{\text{\tint{\tint{\text{\tint{\text{\tint{\text{\tint{\text{\tint{\text{\tin}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tint{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tint{\text{\tinit}\text{\text{\tinit}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tinit}\\\ \tinithting{\text{\tinit}\text{\text{\text{\text{\tinit}\tinity}\\ \text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tinit}}\\ \tinithtint{\text{\text{\tinit}}\\ \tinithtint{\text{\text{\text{\tinit}\tint{\text{\tinit}\text{\text{\text{\text{\tinit}}\\ \tinithtint{\text{\tinithtint{\text{\tinithtint{\text{\tinithtint{\text{\tinithtint{\text{\tinithtin{\text{\tinit}\tint{\tinithtin}\tiint{\text{\tinithtint{\tinithtint{\tinithtint{\tiint{\t
12	Defendant.
13	
14	FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
15	LAW AND ORDER
16	DATE OF HEARING: 05-24-00 TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 A.M.
17	THIS CAUSE having come on for hearing before the Honorable DONALI
18	MOSLEY, District Judge, on the 24th day of May, 2000, the Petitioner not being prese
19	Proper Person, the Respondent being represented by STEWART L. BELL, District Atto

THIS CAUSE having come on for hearing before the Honorable DONALD M. MOSLEY, District Judge, on the 24th day of May, 2000, the Petitioner not being present, in Proper Person, the Respondent being represented by STEWART L. BELL, District Attorney, by and through RANDALL F. WEED, Deputy District Attorney, and the Court having considered the matter, including briefs, transcripts, arguments of counsel, and documents on file herein, now therefore, the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Juan Rico Doss, hereinafter the Defendant, plead guilty to two counts of Pandering of a Child (Felony-NRS 200.300(a)) and one count of Live From the Earnings of a Prostitute (Felony-NRS 201.320). The Defendant was sentenced to a maximum term of one hundred twenty (120) months, with a minimum parole eligibility of forty-eight (48) months in the Nevada Department of Prisons for Count I; Count II to a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) months

Page: 331

1	4. The Defendant failed to offer any explanation as to why the issues concerning
2	alleged error in the pre-trial or trial proceedings were not raised during prior proceedings.
3	Because the Defendant's conviction was based upon a guilty plea, the issues are deemed waived
4	and procedurally barred in accordance with NRS 34.810(1)(a). Furthermore, the allegations
5	raised by the Defendant are belied by the record and lack merit. The Defendant was given notice
6	of the charges in a criminal complaint filed on or about June 1, 1999 and in a Information filed
7	July 20, 1999. The allegation that the victims did not complain to the police that the Defendant
8	was forcing them into prostitution, that they were being forced to testify, or that they were not
9	arrested committing any act of prostitution is repudiated by the witnesses' testimony during the
10	preliminary hearing. (Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings, Case No. 99F08158A, July 13,
11	1999). In <u>Hargrove v. State</u> , 100 Nev. 498, 686 P.2d 222 (1984), the Nevada Supreme Court
12	held a defendant is not entitled to relief on allegations repelled and belied by the record. Id. at
13	502. The Defendant's allegations are clearly repelled and belied by the record as well as
14	procedurally barred NRS 34.810.
15	<u>ORDER</u>
16	THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Defendant's Petition for Writ of
7	Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction) shall be, and it is, hereby denied.
8	DATED this day of June, 2000.
9	Donald M. Mosley
20	DISTRICT JUDGE
21	DISTRICT JODGE
22	STEWART L. BELL DISTRICT ATTORNEY
23	Nevada Bar #000477
4	
25	RANDALL F. WEED
6	Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #000082
7	11074444 Dill #000002
8	

-3-