


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GURINDER KAUR,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR
THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE
HONORABLE JESSIE ELIZABETH
WALSH,
Respondents,
and
RAVINDER GREWAL AND 7-ELEVEN,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 56821

FILED

DEC 09 2010

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This is proper person petition for a writ of mandamus challenging the district court's denial of a motion to dismiss in a contract action.

In an original writ proceeding, the petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted. Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). To meet this burden, the petitioner must submit an appendix containing any orders or parts of the record "that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition." NRAP 21(a)(4). Here, petitioner provided a copy of her reply to real parties in interest's opposition to her motion to dismiss, and the district court hearing transcript on her motion to dismiss, but failed to include other necessary parts of the record, such as the original complaint, her motion to dismiss under NRCP 41(e), and real parties in interest's opposition thereto. Because these documents are essential for understanding the matters set forth in the petition, petitioner has failed to

meet her burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted. NRAP 21(a)(4); Pan, 120 Nev. at 228, 88 P.3d at 844. Accordingly, we deny the petition. NRAP 21(b)(1).

It is so ORDERED.¹

Cherry, J.
Cherry

Saitta, J.
Saitta

Gibbons, J.
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Jessie Elizabeth Walsh, District Judge
Gurinder Kaur
Clark Tatom, LLC
Fennemore Craig, P.C./Las Vegas
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹Our denial is without prejudice to petitioner's right to file a new writ petition accompanied by all necessary supporting documents.

Additionally, in light of this order, we deny as moot petitioner's November 8, 2010, and December 6, 2010, motions to expedite our decision.