

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JULIUS BRADFORD,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 86654-COA

FILED

APR 10 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


Julius Bradford appeals from an order of the district court denying a motion to correct an illegal sentence filed on April 5, 2023. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Michelle Leavitt, Judge.

In his motion, Bradford claimed he was entitled to additional presentence credit pursuant to NRS 176.055. A motion to correct an illegal sentence may only challenge the facial legality of the sentence: either the district court was without jurisdiction to impose a sentence or the sentence was imposed in excess of the statutory maximum. *Edwards v. State*, 112 Nev. 704, 708, 918 P.2d 321, 324 (1996). The district court may summarily deny a motion to correct an illegal sentence if the motion raises issues that fall outside of the very narrow scope of issues permissible in such motions. *Id.* at 708 n.2, 918 P.2d at 325 n.2.

Without considering the merits of Bradford's claim, we conclude it falls outside the narrow scope of claims permissible in a motion to correct

an illegal sentence.¹ Therefore, we conclude the district court did not err by summarily denying Bradford's motion, and we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Michelle Leavitt, District Judge
Julius Bradford
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹We note that a claim for additional presentence credit is a challenge to the validity of the judgment of conviction and sentence that must be raised either on direct appeal or in a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed in compliance with the procedural requirements set forth in NRS Chapter 34. *Griffin v. State*, 122 Nev. 737, 744, 137 P.3d 1165, 1169 (2006).