

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CONRAD G. ANCHETA,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK,

Respondent,

and

ADAM S. KUTNER, P.C.; AND ALLAN
P. LONG,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 78927

FILED

JUL 03 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION

Petitioner, in pro se, filed a Notice of the Filing of the Writ of Mandamus-First Amendment Petition, which this court has construed as a petition for a writ of mandamus. In addition, petitioner submitted an appendix, which only shows various entries on the Eighth Judicial District Court's docket and contains a list of what appears to be the documents petitioner contends are relevant to the resolution of the instant writ petition.

Problematically, petitioner has not stated what relief he seeks nor has he provided this court with exhibits or other documentation that would assist the court in making such a determination. See NRAP 21(a)(4) (providing the petitioner shall submit an appendix containing all documents "essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition").

Therefore, we decline to exercise our original jurisdiction in this matter, see NRS 34.160; NRAP 21(b); *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*,


120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) ("Petitioner[] carr[ies] the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted.").

Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED


Gibbons


Pickering


Hardesty

cc: Conrad G. Ancheta
Backus, Carranza & Burden
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP/Las Vegas
Fassett & Cardoza
Eighth District Court Clerk