

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TRAVIS R. DEAN,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 40345

FILED

JUN 12 2003

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Rubade*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

This is an appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's proper person petition to seal certain portions of his criminal record.


On September 5, 2002, appellant petitioned the district court, pursuant to NRS 179.245 and NRS 179.255, to seal criminal records relating to multiple arrests occurring between 1982 and 1988, and misdemeanor convictions occurring between 1984 and 1985. On September 20, 2002, the district court denied appellant's petition. This appeal followed.


Based upon our review of the record on appeal, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in summarily denying appellant's petition. Appellant failed to include in his petition the pertinent documentation and information required by the relevant statutes.¹ He also failed to make sufficient showings that his arrests which did not lead to convictions and his misdemeanor convictions met the statutory requirements to invoke the district court's discretion to seal

¹See NRS 179.245(1),(2); NRS 179.255(1),(2).

records of these arrests and convictions.² Even apart from these defects, however, appellant's record demonstrates an escalating pattern of criminal behavior, which ultimately culminated in first-degree murder. Thus, he is not the type of person upon whom it is appropriate to confer the substantial benefits of the statutory record-sealing provisions.³ Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.⁴


_____, J.
Shearing


_____, J.
Leavitt


_____, J.
Becker

cc: Hon. Sally L. Loehrer, District Judge
Travis R. Dean
Attorney General Brian Sandoval/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney David J. Roger
Clark County Clerk

²See NRS 179.245(1)(e)-(f),(4); NRS 179.255(1),(4).

³See State v. Cavaricci, 108 Nev. 411, 413, 834 P.2d 406, 408 (1992).

⁴We have considered all proper person documents filed or received in this matter, and we conclude that the relief requested therein, briefing and argument are not warranted. See Luckett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 541 P.2d 910 (1975).