

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROBERT J. CLARKE,

No. 37368

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

FILED

MAY 30 2001

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Richard*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction, pursuant to a guilty plea, of one count of theft. The district court sentenced appellant to a prison term of 12 to 30 months. The district court further ordered appellant to pay restitution in the amount of \$90.00.

Appellant contends that the sentence constitutes cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the United States and Nevada constitutions because the sentence is disproportionate to the crime.¹ We disagree.

The Eighth Amendment does not require strict proportionality between crime and sentence, but forbids only an extreme sentence that is grossly disproportionate to the crime.² Regardless of its severity, a sentence that is within the statutory limits is not "cruel and unusual punishment unless the statute fixing punishment is unconstitutional or the sentence is so unreasonably disproportionate to the offense as to shock the conscience."³

¹Appellant primarily relies on *Solem v. Helm*, 463 U.S. 277 (1983).

²*Harmelin v. Michigan*, 501 U.S. 957, 1000-01 (1991) (plurality opinion).

³*Blume v. State*, 112 Nev. 472, 475, 915 P.2d 282, 284 (1996) (quoting *Culverson v. State*, 95 Nev. 433, 435, 596 P.2d 220, 221-22 (1979)); see also *Glegola v. State*, 110 Nev. 344, 348, 871 P.2d 950, 953 (1994).

01-09000

This court has consistently afforded the district court wide discretion in its sentencing decision.⁴ 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."⁵


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 was within the parameters provided by the relevant statutes.⁶ Accordingly, we conclude that the sentence imposed does not constitute cruel and unusual punishment.

Having considered appellant's contention and concluded that it is without merit, we


ORDER the judgment of conviction AFFIRMED.


Shearing

J.


Agosti

J.


Rose

J.

cc: Hon. Nancy M. Saitta, District Judge
Attorney General
Clark County District Attorney
Clark County Public Defender
Clark County Clerk

⁴See *Houk v. State*, 103 Nev. 659, 747 P.2d 1376 (1987).

⁵*Silks v. State*, 92 Nev. 91, 94, 545 P.2d 1159, 1161 (1976).

⁶See NRS 205.0835(3); NRS 193.130(2)(c).