

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GEOFFREY LEE GROVE,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 89881-COA

FILED

AUG 28 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Geoffrey Lee Grove appeals from a district court order denying a motion to correct an illegal sentence filed on November 5, 2024. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Tierra Danielle Jones, Judge.

In his motion, Grove sought to vacate his sentence because he alleged the sentencing court lacked jurisdiction to impose it. Specifically, he claimed NRS 171.010 lacks any statutory source within the Statutes of Nevada because the statutory source was repealed by Senate Bill 2 in 1957 and the Nevada Supreme Court has previously erred by finding that the Nevada Revised Statutes are prima facie evidence of the laws of Nevada.

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). And such a motion “presupposes a valid conviction.” *Id.* (quotation marks omitted).

Although Grove purports to challenge the district court’s jurisdiction only insofar as it pertains to his sentencing, his arguments implicate the validity of Nevada’s entire statutory scheme and, thus, the

validity of his conviction. Therefore, Grove's claims are outside the scope of claims allowed in a motion to correct an illegal sentence, and without considering the merits of his claims, we conclude the district court did not err by denying Grove's motion. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.¹


_____, C.J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Tierra Danielle Jones, District Judge
Geoffrey Lee Grove
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹The district court also denied the motion as procedurally barred. While this was error, *see Edwards*, 112 Nev. at 708, 918 P.2d at 324 (holding that time constraints and procedural defaults do not apply to motions to correct an illegal sentence), we affirm because the district court also correctly found the claims raised in the motion were outside the scope of a motion to correct an illegal sentence.