

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JARAMIE DEAN WOMACK,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 56416

**FILED**

**FEB 18 2011**

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. Young  
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's motion to correct an illegal sentence.<sup>1</sup> Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; David Wall, Judge.


In his motion, filed on June 8, 2010, appellant claimed that his sentence of multiple concurrent and consecutive terms of life without the possibility of parole was facially illegal because the district court failed to specify minimum and maximum terms pursuant to the requirements of NRS 176.033. Despite appellant's claims, his sentence was not facially illegal. The minimum and maximum terms were merely the same: life without the possibility of parole. As appellant did not otherwise demonstrate that his sentence was facially illegal or that the district court lacked jurisdiction to impose the sentence, the district court did not err in


---


<sup>1</sup>This appeal has been submitted for decision without oral argument, NRAP 34(f)(3), and we conclude that the record is sufficient for our review and briefing is unwarranted. See Lockett v. Warden, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

denying appellant's motion. See Edwards v. State, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>2</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Cherry

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Pickering

cc: Hon. David Wall, District Judge  
Jaramie Dean Womack  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>2</sup>We have reviewed all documents that appellant has submitted in proper person to the clerk of this court in this matter, and we conclude that no relief based upon those submissions is warranted. To the extent that appellant has attempted to present claims or facts in those submissions which were not previously presented in the proceedings below, we have declined to consider them in the first instance.