## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

STEVEN NELSON MURRAY, Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent. No. 68221

FLED

DEC 1 6 2015

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

## ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a pro se appeal from a district court order denying a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Michelle Leavitt, Judge.

Appellant filed his postconviction petition on April 4, 2015, approximately four years after issuance of remittitur on direct appeal on February 28, 2011. *Murray v. State*, Docket No. 54115 (Order of Affirmance, February 3, 2011). Therefore, the petition was untimely filed. *See* NRS 34.726(1). Additionally, his petition was successive as he previously sought postconviction relief.<sup>2</sup> See NRS 34.810(1)(b)(2). His petition was procedurally barred absent a demonstration of good cause and actual prejudice. See NRS 34.726(1); NRS 34.810(1)(b); NRS 34.810(3). Because appellant failed to demonstrate good cause to overcome

<sup>2</sup>Murray v. State, Docket No. 59067 (Order of Affirmance, March 7, 2012).

្លាំង

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This appeal has been submitted for decision without oral argument, NRAP 34(f)(3), and we conclude that the record is sufficient for our review and briefing is unwarranted. See Luckett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

the procedural default, we conclude that the district court did not err by denying appellant's petition as procedurally barred. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>3</sup>

J. Saitta

J.

eriq . J. Pickerin

Gibbons

cc: Hon. Michelle Leavitt, District Judge Steven Nelson Murray Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

<sup>3</sup>We have reviewed all documents that appellant has submitted in proper person to the clerk of this court in this matter, and we conclude that no relief based upon those submissions is warranted. To the extent that appellant has attempted to present claims or facts in those submissions which were not previously presented in the proceedings below, we have declined to consider them in the first instance.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA