IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PAUL DARELL JONES,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 88034-COA

FILED

OCT 09 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY_____
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Paul Darell Jones appeals from a district court order denying a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging the computation for time served filed on August 18, 2023.[1] Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Erika D. Ballou, Judge.

In his petition, Jones neither alleged nor demonstrated that he had exhausted his administrative remedies prior to filing the petition.

---

[1]Jones' pleading was titled as an "application for AB 271." The district court properly construed it as a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging the computation of time served under NRS Chapter 34 as Jones sought the application of credits to his minimum sentence. *See* NRS 34.724(2)(c) (providing that a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus is the sole remedy available to challenge the computation of time served).

24-37925

Accordingly, we conclude the district court did not err by denying his petition.[2] *See* NRS 34.724(1), (2)(c). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.

_____, C.J.
Gibbons

_____, J.
Bulla

_____, J.
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Erika D. Ballou, District Judge
       Paul Darell Jones
       Attorney General/Carson City
       Clark County District Attorney
       Eighth District Court Clerk

---

[2]In his petition, Jones sought the application of credits to his minimum sentence pursuant to Assembly Bill 271 (A.B. 271). The district court addressed the merits of Jones' claim by noting A.B. 271 was never passed into law and thus provided Jones no basis for relief. Although Jones' petition should have been dismissed without prejudice because he did not demonstrate that he had first exhausted his administrative remedies, *see* NRS 34.810(2), we nevertheless affirm, *see Wyatt v. State*, 86 Nev. 294, 298, 468 P.2d 338, 341 (1970) (holding a correct result will not be reversed simply because it is based on the wrong reason).