

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANDRE RAMON WASHINGTON,
Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 41289

ANDRE RAMON WASHINGTON,
Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 41290

FILED

SEP 19 2003

ORDER DISMISSING APPEALS

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
CLERK DEPUTY CLERK

These are consolidated appeals from judgments of conviction, pursuant to guilty pleas. In Docket No. 41289 appellant was convicted of one count of robbery with the use of a firearm and one count of conspiracy to commit robbery. The district court sentenced appellant: to a prison term of 72 to 180 months for robbery, with an equal and consecutive sentence for the use of a deadly weapon; and to a concurrent prison term of 28 to 72 months for conspiracy. In Docket No. 41290, appellant was convicted of one count of robbery with the use of a firearm. The district court sentenced appellant to a prison term of 72 to 180 months with an equal and consecutive sentence for the use of a deadly weapon. The district court further ordered that the sentence in Docket No. 41290 run concurrently with the sentence in Docket No. 41289.

Appellant argues that this court should ensure that he "received a fair entry of plea and sentencing." To the extent that appellant is challenging the validity of his guilty plea, however, this court:

no longer permit[s] a defendant to challenge the validity of a guilty plea on direct appeal from the


judgment of conviction. Instead, a defendant must raise a challenge to the validity of his or her guilty plea in the district court in the first instance, either by bringing a motion to withdraw the guilty plea, or by initiating a post-conviction proceeding.¹


As to any issues regarding sentencing, appellant identifies no issues, beyond stating in a conclusory manner that he "should be allowed a new sentencing." Because the issue has not been adequately briefed, we need not consider appellant's contention.²

Having concluded that appellant's arguments are either not appropriate for review on direct appeal or have not been adequately briefed, we

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.³

 _____, J.
Becker

 _____, J.
Shearing

 _____, J.
Gibbons

¹Bryant v. State, 102 Nev. 268, 272, 721 P.2d 364, 368 (1986).

²Maresca v. State, 103 Nev. 669, 673, 748 P.2d 3, 6 (1987).

³We have considered all proper person documents filed or received in this matter, and we conclude that the relief requested is not warranted.

cc: Hon. Janet J. Berry, District Judge
Robert Bruce Lindsay
Attorney General Brian Sandoval/Carson City
Washoe County District Attorney Richard A. Gammick
Washoe District Court Clerk