

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FELTON L. MATTHEWS, JR.,
Appellant,
vs.
LAS VEGAS JUSTICE COURT, LAS
VEGAS TOWNSHIP; LAS VEGAS
JUSTICE COURT CLERK,
DEPARTMENT 7; WARDEN D. NEVEN;
TRINITY PHARRIS; SGT. KIM; SGT.
SHIELDS; CO GOIN; CO CROPPER; CO
JAMES WILSON; CO HAL
HOLLINGSWORTH; CO J. RIGNEY;
SKYE HOMAN; CO A. SAUNDERS;
DIRECTOR JAMES G. COX EX REL.
NDOC STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondents.

No. 70548

FILED

SEP 27 2016

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a district court order dismissing a petition for a writ of mandamus.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Joanna Kishner, Judge.

Appellant filed a district court original petition for extraordinary relief against respondents, alleging that they interfered with justice court and district court matters that he had previously filed.


¹We direct the clerk of this court to modify the caption on the docket for this appeal to conform to the caption on this order.


The district court dismissed the petition, concluding that appellant was not entitled to extraordinary relief.² This appeal followed.

Having considered appellant's arguments and the record on appeal, we discern no abuse of discretion in the district court's dismissal of appellant's petition for a writ of mandamus. *See Veil v. Bennett*, 131 Nev. ___, ___, 348 P.3d 684, 686 (2015) (providing that a district court's resolution of a petition for a writ of mandamus is generally reviewed for an abuse of discretion). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.³


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Silver

²The district court also concluded that, to the extent appellant intended the petition to be an appeal from a previous action or a new complaint, it should likewise be dismissed. We have considered all of appellant's arguments and conclude that appellant has not demonstrated that the district court erred in reaching this conclusion. *See Buzz Stew, LLC v. City of N. Las Vegas*, 124 Nev. 224, 228, 181 P.3d 670, 672 (2008) (providing that a district court order dismissing a complaint is reviewed de novo); *see also Ogawa v. Ogawa*, 125 Nev. 660, 667, 221 P.3d 699, 704 (2009) (explaining that "[s]ubject matter jurisdiction is a question of law subject to de novo review").

³We deny as moot appellant's request to consolidate this appeal with his appeal in Docket No. 68675. Moreover, we deny all other requests for relief that remain pending in this matter.

cc: Hon. Joanna Kishner, District Judge
Felton L. Matthews, Jr.
Attorney General/Carson City
Attorney General/Las Vegas
Eighth District Court Clerk