IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROGER EDWARD SOLMONSON,

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

No. 36727

FILED

JAN 09 2001

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

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction, pursuant to a guilty plea, of one count of failure to appear after admission to bail. The district court sentenced appellant to serve a prison term of 12-30 months, to run consecutively to all prior convictions.

First, appellant contends that the district court abused its discretion by sentencing appellant to a consecutive rather than a concurrent sentence.

Initially, we note that appellant did not cite to any authority or case law in support of his contention. "It is appellant's responsibility to present relevant authority and cogent argument; issues not so presented need not be addressed by this court." Maresca v. State, 103 Nev. 669, 673, 748 P.2d 3, 6 (1987). Nevertheless, our review of the

This court has consistently afforded the district court wide discretion in its sentencing decision. See Houk v. State, 103 Nev. 659, 747 P.2d 1376 (1987). This court will refrain from interfering with the sentence imposed "[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). Moreover, "a sentence within the statutory limits is not cruel and unusual punishment where the statute itself is constitutional." Griego v. State, 111 Nev. 444, 447, 893 P.2d 995, 997-98 (1995) (citing Lloyd v. State, 94 Nev. 167, 170, 576 P.2d 740, 742 (1978)).

In the instant case, appellant does not allege that the district court relied on impalpable or highly suspect evidence or that the relevant statutes are unconstitutional. Further, we note that the sentence imposed is within the parameters provided by the relevant statutes. See NRS 199.335; NRS 193.130. Moreover, it is within the district court's discretion to impose consecutive sentences. See NRS 176.035(1); Warden v. Peters, 83 Nev. 298, 429 P.2d 549 (1967). We therefore conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by sentencing appellant to a consecutive rather than a concurrent sentence.

(1995) and hold that the statute of limitations for felonies applies to NRS 199.335, and therefore, in appellant's case, expired. More specifically, appellant asks this court to hold that the offense of failure to appear after admission to bail is not a continuing offense. We choose not to revisit this issue and conclude that appellant's contention is without merit, and further note that appellant failed to object to this issue in the district court thus precluding the right to assign error on appeal. See Emmons v. State, 107 Nev. 53, 60-61, 807 P.2d 718, 723 (1991).

Having considered appellant's contentions and concluded that they are without merit, we affirm the judgment of conviction.

It is so ORDERED.

_____, J.
Young

_____, J.
Rose

_____, J.
Becker

cc: Hon. J. Michael Memeo, District Judge
Attorney General
Elko County District Attorney
Elko County Public Defender
Elko County Clerk