

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RONALD CURTIS WILLIAMS,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 82226-COA

FILED

APR 23 2021

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

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Ronald Curtis Williams appeals from an order of the district court denying a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging the computation of time served.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Joseph Hardy, Jr., Judge.

Williams contends the district court erred by denying his petition, filed on March 16, 2020, without first conducting an evidentiary hearing. To warrant an evidentiary hearing, a petitioner must raise claims supported by specific factual allegations that are not belied by the record and, if true, would entitle him to relief. *See Hargrove v. State*, 100 Nev. 498, 502-03, 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984).

Williams claimed he was entitled to the application of statutory credits to the minimum and maximum terms imposed for a conviction of attempted murder. Williams acknowledged that he had expired that sentence before he filed the instant petition. Any question as to the

¹Williams' titled his pleading, "Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983." Because of the nature of the relief sought, the district court properly construed it as a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus. *See NRS 34.724(2)(c)*.


computation of time served on an expired sentence is moot. *Johnson v. Dir., Nevada Dep't of Prisons*, 105 Nev. 314, 316, 774 P.2d 1047, 1049 (1989). Because Williams had expired that sentence, his claim was moot, and we conclude the district court did not err by denying the claim without conducting an evidentiary hearing.

Williams also claimed he was entitled to the application of presentence credits to each of his sentences. Williams was not entitled to have the credit applied to each consecutive term of imprisonment imposed; the credits were properly applied to the ultimate sentence imposed in this case. See NRS 176.055(1); *Kuykendall v. State*, 112 Nev. 1285, 1287, 926 P.2d 781, 783 (1996). We therefore conclude the district court did not err by denying this claim without conducting an evidentiary hearing.

Finally, Williams claimed he was denied the constitutional right to participate in labor or study programs. Inmates have no such right. See NRS 209.4465(2); NRS 209.461(1); *Collins v. Palczewski*, 841 F. Supp. 333, 336-37 (D. Nev. 1993) (recognizing that a prisoner has no independent constitutional right to employment and that the Nevada statutes do not mandate employment). We therefore conclude the district court did not err by denying this claim without conducting an evidentiary hearing. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Bulla

cc: Hon. Joseph Hardy, Jr., District Judge
Ronald Curtis Williams
Attorney General/Carson City
Eighth District Court Clerk