

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FELTON L. MATTHEWS, JR.,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 70855

FILED

JUL 12 2017

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Felton L. Matthews, Jr., appeals from an order of the district court denying a motion for modification of sentence.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, Judge.

Matthews argues the district court erred in denying his June 9, 2016, motion for modification of sentence. In his motion, Matthews claimed his presentence investigation (PSI) report and psychosexual evaluation contained incorrect information about back child support, his family situation, and his mental health. Matthews further asserted the sentencing court was misinformed regarding the following: he threatened the victim's family, he struck a noncommissioned military officer, the victim suffered from anal scarring, he had an outstanding warrant for his

¹This appeal has been submitted for decision without oral argument. NRAP 34(f)(3).

arrest, he had been arrested once for assault or battery with a deadly weapon, and he was a violent homosexual.

The Nevada Supreme Court has already considered these issues and concluded the majority of these claims were not regarding errors in Matthews' criminal record, and the ones that were had been brought to the attention of the sentencing judge, who did not consider them in sentencing. *Matthews, Jr. v. State*, Docket No. 56441 (Order of Affirmance, February 9, 2011); *Matthews, Jr. v. State*, No. 43822 (Order of Affirmance, March 10, 2005). Accordingly, Matthews' claims are barred by the doctrine of the law of the case, which cannot be avoided by more detailed and precisely focused arguments in subsequent filings. *See Hall v. State*, 91 Nev. 314, 316, 535 P.2d 797, 799 (1975). Therefore, the district court did not err in denying these claims.

Next, Matthews appeared to assert a child witness at the preliminary hearing was not reliable, the NDOC has improperly classified him based upon erroneous information regarding an offense committed in Texas, and his ability to access the court system has improperly been limited. These claims fell outside the narrow scope of claims permissible in a motion for modification of sentence. *See Edwards v. State*, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Therefore, without considering the merits of these claims, we conclude the district court did not err in

denying the motion. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.²

Silver, C.J.
Silver

Tao, J.
Tao

Gibbons, J.
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Judge
Felton L. Matthews, Jr.
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

²We have reviewed all documents Matthews has filed in this matter, and we conclude no relief based upon those submissions is warranted. To the extent Matthews has attempted to present claims or facts in those submissions which were not previously presented in the proceedings below, we decline to consider them in the first instance.