

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANTHONY JOSEPH WROBEL,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 88382-COA

FILED

JAN 31 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Anthony Joseph Wrobel appeals from a district court order denying a motion to correct an illegal sentence filed on January 18, 2024. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Tierra Danielle Jones, Judge.

In his motion, Wrobel appeared to claim that (1) Nevada Supreme Court justices improperly participated in the passage of Senate Bill 182 (1951); (2) Senate Bill 182 is facially unconstitutional; and (3) “this filing shows corruption of the federal justices to conceal an ongoing insurrection and overthrow of the Nevada constitutional government.” A motion to correct an illegal sentence may only challenge the facial legality of the sentence: either the district court was without jurisdiction to impose a sentence or the sentence was imposed in excess of the statutory maximum. *Edwards v. State*, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). *Id.* The district court may summarily deny a motion to modify or correct an illegal sentence if the motion raises issues that fall outside of the very narrow scope of issues permissible in such motions. *Id.* at 708 n.2, 918 P.2d at 325 n.2.


Without considering the merits of Wrobel’s claims, we conclude they fall outside the narrow scope of claims permissible in a motion to

modify or correct an illegal sentence. Therefore, we conclude the district court did not err by denying Wrobel's motion.

Wrobel argues on appeal that the district court erred by not allowing him to be present at a hearing on his motion and by allowing the State to make argument at that hearing. Given this court's conclusion that Wrobel's claims were outside the scope of a motion to correct an illegal sentence, we conclude that any error in not allowing Wrobel to be present at the hearing was harmless. See NRS 178.598 ("Any error, defect, irregularity or variance which does not affect substantial rights shall be disregarded."); cf. *Gebers v. State*, 118 Nev. 500, 504, 50 P.3d 1092, 1094-95 (2002) (concluding a petitioner's statutory rights were violated when she was not present at a hearing where testimony and evidence were presented). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.¹


_____, C.J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Westbrook

¹We have reviewed all documents Wrobel has filed in this matter, and we conclude no relief based upon those submissions is warranted. To the extent Wrobel attempts to present claims or facts in those submissions which were not previously presented in the proceedings below, we decline to consider them in the first instance. See *McNelton v. State*, 115 Nev. 396, 415-16, 990 P.2d 1263, 1275-76 (1999).

cc: Hon. Tierra Danielle Jones, District Judge
Anthony Joseph Wrobel
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk