

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PERCY LAVAE BACON,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,

and

QUALITY TOWING D/B/A UNITED
ROAD SERVICES, INC.,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 58414

FILED

FEB 10 2012

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *A. Ingersoll*
DEPUTY CLERK

PERCY LAVAE BACON,
Petitioner,

vs.

D.T.G. OPERATIONS, INC.; AND
THRIFTY/DOLLAR RENTAL, INC.,
Respondents.

No. 58746

PERCY LAVAE BACON,
Petitioner,

vs.

QUALITY TOWING D/B/A UNITED
ROAD SERVICES, INC.,
Respondents.

No. 58929

PERCY LAVAE BACON,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE HONORABLE VALERIE ADAIR,
DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondent,

and

QUALITY TOWING D/B/A UNITED
ROAD SERVICES, INC.,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 58930

PERCY LAVAE BACON,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH,
DISTRICT JUDGE,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 59699

PERCY LAVAE BACON,
Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED ROAD SERVICES, INC. D/B/A
QUALITY TOWING; DTG
OPERATIONS, INC.; AND MIKE
BROOKS,
Respondents.

No. 59981

PERCY LAVAE BACON,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH,
DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondent.

No. 59991

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONS FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT RELIEF
AND TO SHOW CAUSE**

These are seven original proper person petitions for extraordinary relief. The petitions are not consolidated.

Having considered these petitions, we conclude that petitioner's arguments lack merit and that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is not warranted. Accordingly, we deny the petitions. NRAP 21(b)(1); NRAP 21(c).

In addition, a review of this court's docket reveals that, since 2004, petitioner has filed 108 matters with this court, of which 46 have been proper person appeals or petitions for original writs in civil matters. Twenty-five civil appeals or petitions, including the instant petitions, stem

from two district court cases involving the same parties.¹ We previously cautioned petitioner that any further petitions concerning the underlying actions at issue in these seven petitions could result in restrictions on his ability to file papers in forma pauperis. Bacon v. Dist. Ct., Docket Nos. 57411, 57425, 57525, 57526, 57872 (Order Denying Writ Petitions, May 11, 2011).

Our warning was based on petitioner's successive writ petitions that sought relief that had already been denied by this court in previous orders, followed by petitions for rehearing and en banc reconsideration, which were also denied. This court's limited resources are not well spent in reviewing and deciding frivolous petitions and appeals. Also, because petitioner proceeds in forma pauperis without

¹The following matters before this court all arise from Eighth Judicial District Court Case Nos. A495030 and A541431: Bacon v. Cadish, Docket No. 59991; Bacon v. United Road Services, Inc., Docket No. 59981; Bacon v. Cadish, Docket No. 59699; Bacon v. United Road Services, Docket No. 59286; Bacon v. Quality Towing, Docket No. 59285; Bacon v. Quality Towing, Docket No. 58930; Bacon v. Quality Towing, Docket No. 58929; Bacon v. D.T.G. Operations, Inc., Docket No. 58746; Bacon v. Dist. Ct. (Quality Towing), Docket No. 58414; Bacon v. Dist. Ct. (Quality Towing), Docket No. 58200; Bacon v. DTG Operations, Inc., Docket No. 57872; Bacon v. D.T.G. Operations, Inc., Docket No. 57526; Bacon v. D.T.G. Operations, Inc., Docket No. 57525; Bacon v. D.T.G. Operations, Inc., Docket No. 57425; Bacon v. D.T.G. Operations, Inc., Docket No. 57411; Bacon v. Dist. Ct. (Quality Towing), Docket No. 55750; Bacon v. Dist. Ct. (United Road Service), Docket No. 55671; Bacon v. United Road Side Service, Docket No. 55670; Bacon v. D.T.G. Operations, Inc., Docket No. 55570; Bacon v. D.T.G. Operations, Inc., Docket No. 55225; Bacon (Percy) v. Dist. Ct. (United Road Service, Inc.), Docket No. 54907; Bacon v. United Road Service, Docket No. 49938; Bacon v. Hardcastle, Docket No. 49863; Bacon v. Dist. Ct. (Webster), Docket No. 49132; Bacon v. Dist. Ct. (Quality Towing), Docket No. 47720.

paying filing fees or other costs, monetary sanctions are not available to deter these filings. Thus, it appears that restrictions on petitioner's ability to file original petitions and proper person civil appeals in forma pauperis with this court may be appropriate.

Accordingly, petitioner shall have 30 days from the date of this order to show cause why his ability to file civil proper person original writ petitions and appeals in forma pauperis with this court should not be restricted, consistent with the guidelines announced in Jordan v. State, Department of Motor Vehicles, 121 Nev. 44, 110 P.3d 30 (2005), abrogated on other grounds by Buzz Stew, LLC v. City of North Las Vegas, 124 Nev. 224, 181 P.3d 670 (2008).²

It is so ORDERED.

Cherry, J.
Cherry

Pickering, J.
Pickering

Hardesty, J.
Hardesty

cc: Hon. Elissa F. Cadish, District Judge
Hon. Valerie Adair, District Judge
Percy Lavae Bacon
Toschi, Sidran, Collins, and Doyle
Mills & Associates
Travis B. Raymond
Catherine Cortez Masto, Attorney General, Carson City,
Eighth District Court Clerk

²Petitioner shall file his response to this court's show cause order in Docket No. 58414.