IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2

1

3

4 MICHAEL TODD BOTELHO,

v.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Appellant,

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

FILED No. 43247 JAN 0 6 2005 Respondent.

JANETTE M. BLOOM CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

ORIGINA

RESPONDENT'S ANSWERING BRIEF

MICHAEL R. SPECCHIO Public Defender

JOHN REESE PETTY Chief Appellate Deputy P.O. Box 30083 Reno, Nevada 89520-3083

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT

RICHARD A. GAMMICK **District Attorney**

TERRENCE P. McCARTHY Appellate Deputy P.O. Box 30083 Reno, Nevada 89520-3083

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT



1		TABLE OF CONTENTS
2		Page
3	I.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE
4	II.	STATEMENT OF THE FACTS
5	ш.	ARGUMENT
6	IV.	CONCLUSION
7		
8		
9		
10	·	
11		
12		
13	·	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

2	${f \underline{Pag}}$
3	Todd v. State 113 Nev. 18, 25, 931 P.2d 721, 725 (1997)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

4 MICHAEL TODD BOTELHO,

Appellant,

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

v.

No. 43247

Respondent.

RESPONDENT'S ANSWERING BRIEF

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is a direct appeal following pleas of guilty to First Degree Kidnapping and three counts of sexual assault. The district court imposed consecutive prison terms. This appeal followed.

II. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

As indicated in the Opening Brief, appellant kidnapped and thrice sexually assaulted a young girl.

III. ARGUMENT

The sole contention raised on appeal is that the district court should have imposed concurrent prison terms for some of the crimes. That is, he seems to contend that some sexual assaults against children should be a freebie. The State disagrees.

This Court has often held that it will not substitute its judgment for that of the sentencing court where the sentence is within the parameters established by statute. See Todd v. State, 113 Nev. 18, 25, 931 P.2d 721, 725 (1997). Instead, one seeking to avoid a sentence must show that the sentence was illegal, or based solely on impalpable or highly suspect evidence, or the product of some other error of law. Id. Because Botelho has not attempted any such argument, the judgment of the Second Judicial District Court should be affirmed.

26 ll

IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

The district court is charged with imposing sentence. Absent some error of law, this Court ought not to usurp that function. Instead, the judgment of the Second Judicial District Court should be affirmed.

DATED: January 4, 2005.

RICHARD A. GAMMICK District Attorney

By Joynamus McCARTHY
Appellate Deputy

1 2

_ .

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that I have read this appellate brief, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I further certify that this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by appropriate references to the record on appeal. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

DATED this 5 day of January, 2005.

TERRENCE P. McCARTHY

Appellate Deputy Nevada Bar No. 2745

Washoe County District Attorney

P.O. Box 30083

Reno, Nevada 89520-3083

(775) 328-3200

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRAP Rule 25, I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Washoe County District Attorney's Office and that on this date, I forwarded a true copy of the foregoing document, through the Washoe County Interagency Mail, addressed to:

JOHN REESE PETTY Chief Appellate Deputy Washoe County Public Defender's Office Reno, Nevada 89501

Stelly Muchal