## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

HAROLD MARIN, Petitioner, vs. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE JESSIE ELIZABETH WALSH, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents, and THE STATE OF NEVADA, Real Party in Interest. No. 64358 FILED NOV 13 2013 CLERK DE SOUTHERE BY AEPU WLERK

13-33967

## ORDER DENYING PETITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order granting a motion in limine to admit evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts. We conclude that our intervention is not warranted for three reasons. First, petitioner failed to submit an appendix containing the respondent judge's order, relevant parts of the record before the respondent judge, and any other documents that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition. NRAP 21(a)(4). Second, prohibition is not available as petitioner has not demonstrated that the district court proceedings were in excess of its jurisdiction. NRS 34.320. Third, neither writ is available because petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330. In particular, the district court's pretrial evidentiary decision may be reviewed on appeal from the judgment should petitioner be convicted. NRS 177.015(3); NRS 177.045. For these reasons we decline

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA to exercise our discretion to consider the petition. See Poulos v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 98 Nev. 453, 455, 652 P.2d 1177, 1178 (1982); see also State ex rel. Dep't Transp. v. Thompson, 99 Nev. 358, 360, 662 P.2d 1338, 1339 (1983). We therefore,

ORDER the petition DENIED.

J. Gibbons

J. Douglas

J.

Saitta

cc:

Hon. Jessie Elizabeth Walsh, District Judge Justice Law Center Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

 $\mathbf{2}$