


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JERMAINE CURTIS HANKSTON,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 89014-COA

**FILED**

MAY 06 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

Jermaine Curtis Hankston appeals from a judgment of conviction, entered pursuant to a guilty plea, of attempted lewdness with a child under the age of 14 years, first offense. Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; Kathleen A. Sigurdson, Judge.

Hankston contends the district court abused its discretion at sentencing when it made comments referencing sexual assault cases because his offense did not involve allegations of sexual assault. He argues the district court mischaracterized the offense and gave the impression it was imposing a sentence based on its belief in the amorphous impact crimes such as Hankston's have on a societal level. He also claims the district court discounted the evidence regarding his limited cognitive abilities based solely on his ability to continue a relationship with the mother of his child and to maintain previous employment.


The district court has wide discretion in its sentencing decision. *See Houk v. State*, 103 Nev. 659, 664, 747 P.2d 1376, 1379 (1987). Generally, this court will not interfere with a sentence imposed by the district court that falls within the parameters of relevant sentencing statutes "[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.” *Silks v. State*, 92 Nev. 91, 94, 545 P.2d 1159, 1161 (1976); see *Cameron v. State*, 114 Nev. 1281, 1283, 968 P.2d 1169, 1171 (1998).

The district court’s sentence of 8 to 20 years’ imprisonment is within the parameters provided by the relevant statutes. See NRS 193.153(1)(a)(1); NRS 201.230(2). And Hankston does not demonstrate the district court relied on impalpable or highly suspect evidence, as the parties and the information presented to the district court all accurately represented the allegations of the offense. In context, the district court’s comments about sexual assault cases appear more an analogization of the impact of Hankston’s crime on the victim rather than an indication that the court believed Hankston’s case involved sexual assault allegations or that the court was sentencing Hankston based on the societal-level impact of his crime. The record demonstrates that the district court considered Hankston’s evidence regarding his cognitive abilities but that it ultimately did not believe his request for probation was appropriate given other considerations, such as the lifelong impact Hankston’s crime would have on the victim. Having considered the sentence and the crime, we conclude the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing Hankston. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of conviction AFFIRMED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Bulla

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Kathleen A. Sigurdson, District Judge  
Washoe County Public Defender  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Washoe County District Attorney  
Washoe District Court Clerk