

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RAJA MITTAL,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE RENA  
G. HUGHES, DISTRICT JUDGE,  
Respondents,  
and  
KRISTEN BROWN,  
Real Party in Interest.

No. 74528

**FILED**

NOV 30 2017

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. Young  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION  
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION*

Raja Mittal petitions for a writ of mandamus, or in the alternative prohibition, challenging a district court order denying a motion to modify child custody. Whether to consider a writ petition is within this court's discretion. *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). And petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

We have considered this petition, and we conclude that petitioner has not met his burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted; namely, petitioner has failed to provide the court with the facts and documentation essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition.<sup>1</sup> See NRAP 21(a)(3) (setting forth the required contents of the


---

<sup>1</sup>We note that under NRAP 3(A)(b)(7), certain district court orders that finally establish or alter custody of minor children are substantively

petition); NRAP 21(a)(4) (requiring petitioner's appendix to include a copy of any order or parts of the record that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition). Accordingly, we deny the petition. See NRAP 21(b)(1); *Smith*, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851.

It is so ORDERED.<sup>2</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Silver

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Tao

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Rena G. Hughes, District Judge, Family Court Division  
Raja Mittal  
The Law Offices of Frank J. Toti, Esq.  
Eighth District Court Clerk

appealable. Petitioner has not provided this court sufficient information regarding the challenged district court order to determine whether he may have an adequate legal remedy in the form of appeal. See *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004) (recognizing that the right to appeal generally precludes writ relief).

<sup>2</sup>We further deny as moot petitioner's emergency motion to stay the district court's order regarding psychological evaluations pending the resolution of this petition.