

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRYAN PHILLIP BONHAM,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 85890-COA

FILED

MAY 11 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


Bryan Phillip Bonham appeals from an order of the district court denying a motion to correct an illegal sentence filed on September 27, 2022. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Jacqueline M. Bluth, Judge.

In his motion, Bonham argued that the district court lacked jurisdiction to sentence him because the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) were not properly enacted since they lack enacting clauses, the process for repealing and creating the NRS was not proper, and the Legislature improperly delegated power to the revision committee. Bonham raised these claims in a previous motion to correct an illegal sentence, and this court affirmed the denial of those claims on appeal. *See Bonham v. State*, Nos. 84105-COA, 84280-COA, 2022 WL 1831282 (Nev. Ct. App. June 2, 2022) (Order of Affirmance). Thus, Bonham's claims were barred by the doctrine of law of the case which "cannot be avoided by a more detailed and precisely focused argument." *Hall v. State*, 91 Nev. 314, 316, 535 P.2d 797, 799 (1975). Therefore, we conclude that the district court did not err by denying the motion.

On appeal, Bonham appears to argue that his appeal should be heard because the untimely filing of documents interfered with his ability to be present at hearings in the district court. The record indicates the hearings at issue were not evidentiary hearings, no testimony was presented, and the district court merely stated its findings on the record. Bonham failed to demonstrate that he was prejudiced by his absence at the relevant hearings. *Cf. Gebers v. State*, 118 Nev. 500, 504, 50 P.3d 1092, 1094-95 (2002) (concluding a petitioner's statutory rights were violated when she was not present at a hearing where testimony and evidence were presented). Further, given that Bonham's motion to correct an illegal sentence was barred by the doctrine of law of the case, Bonham failed to demonstrate his substantial rights were violated by the allegedly untimely filing of his documents. *See* NRS 178.598 ("Any error, defect, irregularity or variance which does not affect substantial rights shall be disregarded."). Thus, Bonham fails to demonstrate he is entitled to relief on this claim. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Jacqueline M. Bluth, District Judge
Bryan Phillip Bonham
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk