

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DWIGHT HANZY,

No. 37917

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

FILED

OCT 12 2001

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

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction, pursuant to a guilty plea, of one count of burglary. The district court sentenced appellant to a prison term of 48 to 120 months, to run consecutive to appellant's sentence in another district court case.

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

This court has consistently afforded the district court wide discretion in its sentencing decision.⁴ This court will refrain from

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

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

³Blume 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).


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


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 statute is unconstitutional. Further, we note that the sentence imposed was within the parameters provided by the relevant statute.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.⁷

 J.
Young

 J.
Agosti

 J.
Leavitt

cc: Hon. Donald M. Mosley, District Judge
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Clark County Public Defender
Clark County Clerk

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

⁶See NRS 205.060(2).

⁷We have considered all proper person documents filed or received in this matter, and we conclude that the relief requested is not warranted.