

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DARION MUHAMMAD-COLEMAN,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 89560-COA

**FILED**

**JUN 16 2025**

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY:   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

Darion Muhammad-Coleman appeals from a district court order denying a motion to correct an illegal sentence filed on September 11, 2024. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Erika D. Ballou, Judge.


In his motion, Muhammad-Coleman claimed his sentence was illegal because it was directly contrary to the sentence agreed upon in the guilty plea agreement, it violated the contract clause because he went to trial when everyone agreed he would plead guilty, and the instant conviction was used to enhance his conviction in another case.


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). “A motion to correct an illegal sentence presupposes a valid conviction and may not, therefore, be used to challenge alleged errors in proceedings that occur prior to the imposition of sentence.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

Muhammad-Coleman’s claims challenged his conviction and sentence in a different case. While negotiations relating to that other case

were included in the guilty plea agreement for the instant case, the issues raised by Mohammad-Coleman relate to his decision to not plead guilty pursuant to negotiations and to proceed to trial in that other case. We note that in this case, Muhammad-Coleman received the sentence of 8 to 20 years in prison he stipulated to in the guilty plea agreement. This sentence was facially legal, *see* NRS 193.165(1); NRS 199.480(1)(a); NRS 200.380(2); NRS 205.060(5); NRS 207.190(2)(a), and Muhammad-Coleman failed to demonstrate the district court lacked jurisdiction to sentence him in this case. Accordingly, we conclude the district court did not err by denying the motion, and we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>1</sup>

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup>On appeal, Muhammad-Coleman argues the district court erred by denying his motion without conducting an evidentiary hearing or considering the merits of his motion. Given our conclusions above, we conclude the district court did not err.

cc: Hon. Erika D. Ballou, District Judge  
Darion Muhammad-Coleman  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk