

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JESUS RAMIREZ-FELIX,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 90946-COA

FILED

FEB 27 2026

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Jesus Ramirez-Felix appeals from a judgment of conviction, entered pursuant to a guilty plea, of attempted sexual assault. Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; Tammy Riggs, Judge.

Ramirez-Felix argues the district court abused its discretion at sentencing by relying on impalpable or highly suspect evidence when it stated that Ramirez-Felix followed the victim to her apartment to get money for the Uber ride. Ramirez-Felix argues that there is no evidence in the record that he followed the victim to get payment from her and that he was prejudiced because the district court relied on this impalpable and highly suspect evidence to sentence him more harshly.

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,

26-09334

1161 (1976); see *Cameron v. State*, 114 Nev. 1281, 1283, 968 P.2d 1169, 1171 (1998).

After reviewing the record, we conclude the district court did not rely on impalpable or highly suspect evidence that Ramirez-Felix followed the victim to get payment. Rather, the district court's statement demonstrated that it rejected any speculation that Ramirez-Felix followed the victim for payment. Instead, the district court's comments demonstrate it was opining that there was no legitimate reason for Ramirez-Felix to leave his vehicle other than to take advantage of the victim. Thus, we conclude the district court did not abuse its discretion when sentencing Ramirez-Felix to 8 to 20 years in prison.¹ Further, the district court made it clear that it was sentencing Ramirez-Felix to the maximum sentence because of the facts of the crime and the position of trust he was placed in by being an Uber driver. Thus, Ramirez-Felix fails to show he was prejudiced by any purported error by the district court. We conclude Ramirez-Felix is not entitled to relief, and we

ORDER the judgment of conviction AFFIRMED.


_____, C.J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Westbrook

¹This sentence was within the parameters of the relevant statutes. See NRS 193.153(1)(a)(1); NRS 200.366(2).

cc: Hon. Tammy Riggs, District Judge
The Law Office of Richard P. Davies, Esq.
Attorney General/Carson City
Washoe County District Attorney
Washoe District Court Clerk