IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Appellant, vs. DEAN GIBBONS, Respondent. No. 59615

FILED

TRACIE K, LINDEMAN CLERK OF SUPREME COURT BY DEPUTY CLERK

JUN 122014

ORDER OF REVERSAL AND REMAND

This is an appeal by the State from an order of the district court granting respondent Dean Gibbons's post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Donald M. Mosley, Judge.

Gibbons filed a petition on May 31, 2011, challenging his sentence and conditions of lifetime supervision in district court case number C59615. At the time that Gibbons filed his petition, he had expired his sentence of imprisonment and was subject only to lifetime supervision. On appeal, the State argues that the district court erred in granting the petition and striking the conditions of lifetime supervision that were imposed on Gibbons by the Department of Parole and Probation. We agree. A person on lifetime supervision may not file a post-conviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus because he is not under a sentence of death or imprisonment as required by NRS 34.724. See Coleman v. State, 130 Nev. ____, ____, 321 P.3d 863, 867 (2014). Therefore, because Gibbons did not meet the imprisonment requirement of NRS 34.724, he was not eligible for post-conviction habeas relief. See id. For this reason, we conclude that the district court erred in granting Gibbons's post-conviction

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA petition for a writ of habeas corpus and releasing Gibbons from the conditions of lifetime supervision.¹ Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court REVERSED AND REMAND this matter to the district court for proceedings consistent with this order.

ickering J. Pickering J. Parraguirre

ياري ، J. Saitta

cc: Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court Hon. J. Charles Thompson, Senior Judge Hon. Adriana Escobar, District Judge Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Turco & Draskovich Eighth District Court Clerk

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

¹We note that the district court did not provide findings of fact or conclusions of law in its order. To the extent that the district court granted relief to Gibbons under NRS 176.0931(3), the district court did not have the authority to do this, as Gibbons did not meet the statutory requirements for release from his lifetime supervision sentence.