

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JUAN ACOSTA,
Petitioner,
vs.
JANELLE REEVES; KELLY REEVES;
H.M. JON NORHEIM; CLARK COUNTY
FAMILY COURT; LLOYD D. GEORGE;
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT;
DOMINIQUE MCELROY; AND
DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES,
Respondents.

No. 70351

FILED

JUL 13 2016

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


ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT RELIEF


This is a pro se original petition for extraordinary writ relief challenging a guardianship created for the minor children and requesting that the children be returned to petitioner's custody.


Having reviewed the petition and the attached documentation, we conclude that petitioner has not demonstrated that our intervention by extraordinary writ relief is warranted. *See Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228-29, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (explaining that it is petitioner's burden to demonstrate that writ relief is warranted). NRAP 21(a)(4) requires the petitioner to submit with the petition an appendix that contains copies of any order or other parts of the record that may be essential to understanding the matters contained in the petition. Here, petitioner indicates that he filed a petition to terminate the guardianship and the court master recommended that the petition be denied at a hearing held on April 19, 2016, but petitioner has not provided this court with a copy of his petition to terminate the guardianship, the master's recommendation, or a district court order approving the master's recommendation, and thus, we are unable to adequately evaluate

petitioner's claims. See EDCR 1.46(g)(9) ("No recommendation of a master or disposition of a juvenile case will become effective until expressly approved by the supervising district court judge."). Accordingly, we conclude that petitioner has not demonstrated that this court's intervention by extraordinary writ relief is warranted at this time, and we deny the petition. See NRAP 21(b)(1); *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (stating that a petition for extraordinary writ relief is purely discretionary with this court).

It is so ORDERED.


_____, J.
Cherry


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Gibbons

cc: Juan Acosta
Eighth District Court Clerk