

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MATTHEW JAMES KING,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CARSON CITY,

Respondent,


and

THE STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS;
SGT. MILLER, C/O E. WILLIAMS,
Real Parties in Interest.¹

No. 75092

FILED

MAR 28 2018

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus seeks an order directing real parties in interest to return seized property.

A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion. See NRS 34.160; *Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Judicial Dist. Court*, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). Writ relief is typically not available, however, when the petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. See NRS 34.170; *Int'l Game Tech.*, 124 Nev. at 197, 179 P.3d at 558. Moreover, 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


¹We direct the clerk of the court to amend the caption for this case to conform to the caption on this order.

that extraordinary relief is warranted. *See Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

Having considered the petition, we conclude that petitioner has failed to demonstrate that extraordinary writ relief is warranted. *See id.* Accordingly, we deny the petition. *See* NRAP 21(b)(1); *Smith*, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851.

It is so ORDERED.


_____, C.J.
Silver


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Gibbons

cc: Matthew James King
Attorney General/Carson City
Carson City Clerk