IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

VICKIE LYNN FARROW,

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

No. 36279

FILED

SEP 06 2000

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction, pursuant to a guilty plea, of one count of trafficking in a controlled substance.[1] The district court sentenced appellant to serve a term of 10 to 25 years in the Nevada State Prison, and pay a fine of $5,000.00; appellant was given credit for 110 days time served.

Appellant challenges the district court's denial of her motion to suppress evidence discovered in her vehicle following a traffic stop, arrest, and inventory search.[2]

First, appellant contends the police officer's search of the vehicle did not fall within the inventory search exception to the Fourth Amendment's warrant requirement[3]

[1]Appellant was convicted pursuant to NRS 453.3385(3).

[2]Appellant entered a conditional guilty plea which preserved her right to appeal the district court's denial of the motion to suppress. See NRS 174.035(3).

[3]U.S. Const. amend. IV.

because the search was merely a ruse for conducting an otherwise impermissible search. We conclude that this contention lacks merit. This court recently stated that the "[f]indings of fact in a suppression hearing will not be disturbed on appeal if supported by substantial evidence." State v. Johnson, 116 Nev. ___, ___, 993 P.2d 44, 45-46 (2000) (citing Rice v. State, 113 Nev. 425, 427, 936 P.2d 319, 320 (1997)). Furthermore, "a district court's findings are reviewed under a deferential standard." Id. at ___, 993 P.2d at 46 (citing Hayes v. State, 106 Nev. 543, 550 n.1, 797 P.2d 962, 966 n.1 (1990)). The district court found that the officer decided to impound the vehicle because it could not legally be driven on the street, and that a reasonable inventory of appellant's vehicle was conducted. Moreover, the district court found that the officer did not conduct the type of "intense and minute" search prohibited by State v. Greenwald, 109 Nev. 808, 810, 858 P.2d 36, 38 (1993). We conclude the district court did not err in dismissing appellant's contention.[4]

Second, appellant contends the district court abused its discretion by determining that appellant failed to provide substantial assistance pursuant to NRS 453.3405(2), and therefore was not entitled to receive a sentence reduction. Although appellant did provide the names of two of her drug

[4]We have considered appellant's remaining contentions pertaining to the suppression motion and conclude they lack merit and do not warrant discussion.

contacts, law enforcement officials were not able to put any of the information to beneficial use. As a result, the district concluded that appellant had not rendered substantial assistance. The decision to grant a sentence reduction under NRS 453.3405(2) is a discretionary function of the district court. See Matos v. State, 110 Nev. 834, 838, 878 P.2d 288, 290 (1994). We conclude the district court properly exercised discretion in denying appellant a sentence reduction pursuant to NRS 453.3405.

Having considered appellant's contentions and concluded that they are without merit, we

ORDER this appeal dismissed.

Maupin, J.

Shearing, J.

Becker, J.

cc: Hon. Steven P. Elliott, District Judge
Attorney General
Washoe County District Attorney
Dennis A. Cameron
Washoe County Clerk