



IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

VANESA GERALDINE LANDABURU
A/K/A VANESA GERALDINE
LANDADURU A/K/A ERICA ORNELAS
A/K/A ELENA VERDUZCO,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 92254-COA

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Vanesa Geraldine Landaburu appeals from an order of revocation of probation and second amended judgment of conviction. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Hon. Nadia Krall, Judge.

Landaburu claims the district court abused its discretion when it revoked her probation because it failed to meaningfully consider statements offered by her and her counsel in support of her request for probation to be reinstated. Specifically, she points to statements that she was denied an interstate compact and would serve out the balance of her probation term in Nevada with no family support; that she was willing to follow any substance abuse or mental health recommendations after an evaluation; that she accepted a favorable plea deal in her new felony drug case, thus suggesting diminished criminal culpability; and that she was sick and getting a ride to the pharmacy at the time of her new felony drug offense, which is why she was found in a car with drugs.

A district court may revoke probation for a nontechnical violation, NRS 176A.630(1)(a), which includes “[t]he commission of a . . . [n]ew felony,” NRS 176A.510(8)(c)(1)(I). “The decision to revoke probation is within the district court’s broad discretion and will not be disturbed absent a clear

showing of abuse of that discretion.” *Garcia v. State*, 142 Nev., Adv. Op. 42, 590 P.3d 920, 924 (2026) (quotation marks omitted). “Evidence supporting revocation must be sufficient to reasonably satisfy the court that the conduct of the probationer has not been as good as required by the conditions of probation.” *Id.* (quotation marks omitted).

At the revocation hearing, Landaburu stipulated that she violated her probation by committing a new felony. She and her attorney were afforded the opportunity to speak in support of her request to have probation reinstated, and they offered the above-identified mitigating statements as well as statements that Landaburu had both a job and a residence secured. *See Cooper v. State*, 134 Nev. 399, 400, 422 P.3d 722, 725 (2018) (“[A]t a minimum, due process at a revocation hearing requires a probationer be given an opportunity to be heard and to show . . . that circumstances in mitigation suggest that the violation does not warrant revocation.”). Nothing in the record indicates the district court failed to meaningfully consider Landaburu’s statements or request. And the record supports the district court’s conclusion that Landaburu’s conduct was not as good as required by the conditions of her probation. Therefore, we conclude Landaburu has not demonstrated the district court abused its discretion when revoking probation, and we

ORDER the order for revocation of probation and second amended judgment of conviction AFFIRMED.



Bulla, C.J.



Gibbons, J.



Westbrook, J.

cc: Hon. Nadia Krall, District Judge
Adras & Altig Attorneys at Law
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk