



**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
CLERK OF THE COURT**

REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER  
200 LEWIS AVENUE, 3<sup>rd</sup> FL.  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89155-1160  
(702) 671-4554

Electronically Filed  
May 18 2022 09:43 a.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

Steven D. Grierson  
Clerk of the Court

Anntoinette Naumec-Miller  
Court Division Administrator

---

May 18, 2022

Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of the Court  
201 South Carson Street, Suite 201  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4702

RE: STATE OF NEVADA vs. MARK SIMS  
**S.C. CASE: 84717**  
D.C. CASE: C-20-352400-1

Dear Ms. Brown:

On May 12, 2022 our office submitted a Notice of Appeal packet for the above referenced case noting that the minutes from March 3, 2022 were not included. The minutes have now been completed and are enclosed. Please contact our office at (702) 671-0512 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

STEVEN D. GRIERSON, CLERK OF THE COURT

/s/ Heather Ungermann  
Heather Ungermann, Deputy Clerk

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA****Felony/Gross Misdemeanor****COURT MINUTES****March 03, 2022**

---

C-20-352400-1      State of Nevada  
                                 vs  
                                 Mark Sims

---

**March 03, 2022      8:30 AM      Request**

**HEARD BY:** Wiese, Jerry A.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 14A

**COURT CLERK:** Lauren Kidd

**RECORDER:** Vanessa Medina

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Kern, Samuel R.	Attorney
	Schmidt, Robert J.	Attorney
	Sims, Mark	Defendant
	State of Nevada	Plaintiff

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- State and Defendant present via BlueJeans video conferencing.

Mr. Schmidt advised the matter was not negotiated, Defendant would stipulate to the violations and argue for reinstatement. Court reviewed the violation report and Defendant indicated he did not agree to the violations listed therein. Mr. Schmidt reminded the Defendant that when they spoke he agreed to stipulate to the violation. Upon Court's inquiry, Defendant confirmed that he was stipulating to the violation and he agreed that he did the things written in the violation report. State noted that Defendant was given multiple opportunities to complete probation and this was Defendant's Fifth violation of probation. Argument by the State in support of revocation. Mr. Schmidt argued the Defendant should not be revoked and the matter was currently in the position of NRS 176A.630(2)(c)(3), because Court revoked the Defendant for 90 days at the last revocation hearing. Mr. Schmidt stated there was evidence that Defendant was completing his probationary requirements. Mr. Schmidt advised Defendant had 151 days of credit for time served. Mr. Schmidt requested the Defendant be dishonorably discharged and Court close this case out. Court reviewed Defendant's prior revocation hearings which resulted in reinstatements. Court indicated the

Defendant was ordered to have no contact with Ebony Thomas, yet Defendant still continued to contact Ms. Thomas. Court noted the fact that the Court gave the Defendant a break and did not give the Defendant consecutive time for each violation, did not mean that the Defendant could not be revoked now. Argument by Mr. Schmidt regarding the nature of the phone calls between Defendant and Ebony Thomas. COURT ORDERED, PROBATION REVOKED; original SENTENCE of a MINIMUM of TWELVE (12) MONTHS and a MAXIMUM of THIRTY-SIX (36) MONTHS in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC) IMPOSED with ONE HUNDRED FIFTY-ONE (151) DAYS credit for time served.

NDC