1		
2	Michael W. Sanft (8245) SANFT LAW	
3	2880 W. Sahara Ave.	Flootropically Filed
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 (702)497-8008 (office)	Electronically Filed Jun 18 2019 01:25 p.m.
5	(703)297-6582 (facsimile)	Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court
6	michael@sanftlaw.com Attorney for Appellant	·
7		
8	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA	
9		G N = 50500
10	JAMES HOWARD HAYES, JR.,	Case No. : 78590
11	Appellant,	
12	vs.	FAST TRACK STATEMENT
13	STATE OF NEVADA,	FASI TRACK STATEMENT
14		
15	Respondent.	
16 17	1 N 0 10010 110	e da la da la
18	1. Name of party filing this fast track statement: JAMES	
19	HOWARD HAYES, JR.	
20	2. Name, law firm, address, and telephone number of attorney	
21	submitting this fast track statement: Michael Sanft, Esq., SANFT LAW,	
22	2880 West Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102; (702) 497-8008.	
23	2000 West Sanara Wende, Las Vegas, Wevada 07102, (702) 477-0000.	
24	3. Name, law firm, address, and telephone number of appellate	
25	counsel if different from trial counsel: n/a	
26		
27		
28		1

- 4. **Judicial district, county, and district court docket number of lower court proceedings:** Eighth Judicial District, Clark County, Docket No.
 C-16-315718-1
- 5. Name of judge issuing decision, judgment, or order appealedfrom: The Honorable William Kephart.
- 6. **Length of trial.** If this action proceeded to trial in the district court, how many days did the trial last? Appellant pled guilty pursuant to the Alford decision. There was no trial.
 - 7. **Conviction(s) appealed from:** Count 1- Attempt Grand Larceny
- 8. **Sentence for each count:** Appellant was sentenced under the small Habitual Statute to 60 to 174 months.
- 9. Date district court announced decision, sentence, or order appealed from: March 6, 2019.
- 10. **Date of entry of written judgment or order appealed from:** March 12, 2019.
- (a) If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review: n/a
- 11. If this appeal is from an order granting or denying a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, indicate the date written notice of entry of judgment or order was served by the court: n/a

- 18. **Pending and prior proceedings in other courts.** List the case name, number and court of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts which are related to this appeal (e.g., habeas corpus proceedings in state or federal court, bifurcated proceedings against co-defendants): State of Nevada v. James Hayes, C-19-338412-1, Eighth Judicial District Court, Department 19.
- 19. **Proceedings raising same issues.** List the case name and docket number of all appeals or original proceedings presently pending before this court, of which you are aware, which raise the same issues you intend to raise in this appeal: None.
- 20. **Procedural history.** Briefly describe the procedural history of the case (provide citations for every assertion of fact to the appendix, if any, or to the rough draft transcript): Information, filed June 17, 2016 (A001-A003); Guilty Plea Agreement, dated November 7, 2018 (A004-A012); Judgment of Conviction, dated March 12, 2019 (A013); and Notice of Appeal filed pro se on March 28, 2019 (A014-A18).
- 21. **Statement of facts.** Briefly set forth the facts material to the issues on appeal: Appellant entered into a guilty plea agreement pursuant to *North Carolina v. Alford* for one count of Attempt Grand Larceny, a category D felony (A004-A012). The State agreed to not oppose probation with the only

condition that Appellant serve thirty days in the Clark County Detention

Center with thirty days credit for time served (A004). Appellant further

waived his right to a direct appeal of his conviction and the assistance of an

attorney, "unless specifically reserved in writing and agreed upon as provided
in NRS 174.035(3)"(A008).

Before sentencing and after he was released on parole, Appellant was arrested and charged with a new incident involving Burglary and Unlawful Use of Hotel Key in Case No. C-19-338412-1 (A019-A021). The new case allowed the State under the terms of the guilty plea agreement to argue for any lawful sentence, including for the habitual criminal (A005). The Court sentenced Appellant under the small habitual statute to five (5) to fourteen and a half (14.5) years in prison (A013). Appellant then filed an appeal pro se (A014-A018).

22. **Issues on appeal.** State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal: The principal issue is cruel and unusual punishment. Appellant was judged too harshly, even if he committed the same type of crimes shortly after being released from prison and while he awaited sentencing. Even though he legally qualified to sentencing under the habitual statute, the sentence constitutes cruel and unusual punishment.

23. **Legal argument, including authorities:** The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." U.S. Const. amend. VIII; *McConnell v. State*, 120 Nev. 1043, 1063, 102 P.3d 606, 620 (2004). Similarly, article 1, section 6 of the Nevada Constitution provides: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor shall cruel or unusual punishments be inflicted" Nev. Const. art. 1, § 6.

The Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution forbids an extreme sentence that is grossly disproportionate to the crime. *Chavez v. State*, 125 Nev. Adv. Rep. 29, 213 P.3d 476, 489 (2009) (citing *Harmelin v. Michigan*, 501 U.S. 957, 1000-01 (1991) (plurality opinion)). Regardless of its severity, a sentence that is within the statutory limits is cruel and unusual punishment if the statute fixing punishment is unconstitutional or the sentence is so unreasonably disproportionate to the offense as to "shock the conscience." Id., 213 P.3d at 489 (quoting *Blume v. State*, 112 Nev. 472, 475, 915 P.2d 282, 284 (1996)). This Court affords the district court wide discretion in its sentencing decision. Id., 213 P.3d at 490. Therefore, this Court will refrain from interfering with the sentence imposed "[s]o long as the record does not demonstrate prejudice resulting from consideration of information or accusations founded on facts supported only by impalpable or highly suspect

evidence." Id., 213 P.3d at 490 (quoting *Silks v. State*, 92 Nev. 91, 94, 545 P.2d 1159, 1161 (1976)).

Here, the sentence imposed upon Appellant by the district court constitutes cruel and unusual punishment, because it was grossly disproportionate to the crime, and, therefore, shocks Appellant's conscience. While the sentence at issue fell within the statutorily established range of punishment, the lengthy prison sentence imposed upon Appellant by the district was grossly disproportionate to the crime. Admittedly, even though Appellant was just released from prison, and committed the same type of burglary as what he was awaiting sentencing on, these facts do not justify the district court's decision to subject Appellant to habitual criminal treatment. The district court abused its discretion by imposing on Appellant a sentence that was so unreasonably disproportionate to the offense.

- 24. **Preservation of issues.** State concisely how each enumerated issue on appeal was preserved during trial. If the issue was not preserved, explain why this court should review the issue: There was no trial.
- 25. **Issues of first impression or of public interest.** Does this appeal present a substantial legal issue of first impression in this jurisdiction or one affecting an important public interest: If so, explain: No.

VERIFICATION

I hereby certify that this fast track statement complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4) including at least a one inch margin on all sides and consecutive numbering of pages, the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this fast track statement has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word for Macintosh in Times New Roman 14 point font.

I further certify that this fast track statement complies with the page- or type-volume limitations of NRAP 3C(h)(2) because it does not exceed 10 pages.

Finally, I recognize that under NRAP 3C I am responsible for timely filing a fast track statement and that the Supreme Court of Nevada may impose sanctions for failing to timely file a fast track statement, or failing to raise material issues or arguments in the fast track statement. I therefore certify that the information provided in this fast track statement is true and

. . .

. . .

. . .

complete to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. DATED this 18th day of June, 2019. SANFT LAW MICHAEL'W. SANFT 2880 West Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Tel: (702) 497-8008 michael@sanftlaw.com Attorney for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

1. I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2010 in 14-point Times New Roman.

- 2. I further certify that this brief does complies with the page- or type-volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by NRAP 32(a)(7)(C), it is proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more, and contains 1,213 words.
- 3. Finally, I hereby certify that I have read this appellate brief, but to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, cannot certify that 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)(1), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by a reference to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where the matter relied on is to be found. 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 18th day of June, 2019.

SANFT LAW

MICHAEL W. SANFT 2880 West Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Tel: (702) 497-8008

michael@sanftlaw.com Attorney for Appellant

ROUTING STATEMENT

NRAP 28(a)(5) mandates that an appellant's brief contain a routing statement setting forth the following:

whether the matter is presumptively retained by the Supreme Court or assigned to the Court of Appeal under NRAP 17, and citing the subparagraph(s) of the Rule under which the matter falls

NRAP 17(b) provides that the Court of Appeals "shall hear and decide only those matters assigned to it by the Supreme Court." NRAP 17(b)(1) further provides that any direct appeal from a judgment of conviction based on a plea of guilty are presumptively assigned to the Court of Appeals.

The foregoing Appellant's Fast Track Statement should be assigned to the Court of Appeals, because this matter involves a direct appeal from a judgment of conviction based on a plea of guilty.

DATED this 18th day of June, 2019.

SANFT LAW

MICHAEL W. SANFT 2880 West Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

Tel: (702) 497-8008 michael@sanftlaw.com Attorney for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION 1 2 The undersigned hereby declares that on June 18, 2019, an electronic 3 copy of the foregoing APPELLANT'S FAST TRACK STATEMENT was sent 4 via the master transmission list with the Nevada Supreme Court to the 5 following: 6 7 STEPHEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney 8 Regional Justice Center 9 200 South Lewis Avenue, Third Floor P.O. Box 552511 10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2211 11 ADAM PAUL LAXALT 12 Nevada Attorney General 13 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 14 15 16 MICHAEL W. SANFT 2880 West Sahara Avenue 17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 18 Tel: (702) 497-8008 michael@sanftlaw.com 19 Attorney for Appellant 20 21 22 23 24 25

26

27