

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

COURTNEY LANGSTON LOWE,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 67081

FILED

JUN 10 2015

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a pro se appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant Courtney Langston Lowe's motion to modify his sentence.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Jerome T. Tao, Judge.

In his motion filed on October 9, 2014, Lowe claimed that he was misinformed about the length of his sentence and that his sentences should run concurrently rather than consecutively because he has asthma and is having respiratory problems due to construction at the jail. Lowe's claims fell outside the narrow scope of claims permissible in a motion to


¹This 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).

To the extent Lowe attempts to appeal from the denial of his motions for affirmative injunction, affirmative relief and release, estoppel by silence, common law liens, declaratory relief, "term of art ejusde generis rule," and "Moses under code of canon law," these decisions are not appealable. *See Castillo v. State*, 106 Nev. 349, 352, 792 P.2d 1133, 1135 (1990).


15-17722

modify a sentence. *See Edwards v. State*, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). Therefore, without considering the merits of any of the claims raised in the motion, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying the motion. Accordingly, we


ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.²



Saitta



Gibbons



Pickering

cc: Eighth Judicial District Court Dept. 20
Courtney Langston Lowe
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

²We have reviewed all documents that Lowe has submitted 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 Lowe 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.