IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MATTHEW DOUGLAS BAKER, Petitioner,

Real Parties in Interest.

VS.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS W. HERNDON, DISTRICT JUDGE. Respondents, and THE STATE OF NEVADA; AND PERRY RUSSELL, WARDEN OF WARM SPRINGS CORRECTIONAL CENTER.

No. 79107

FILED

SEP 1 2 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This petition for a writ of prohibition challenges a district court order transferring a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus to the county where petitioner is incarcerated. Petitioner acknowledges that the habeas petition challenges the parole eligibility date and application of NRS 213.12135, not the judgment of conviction or sentence. Because he did not challenge the validity of his conviction, the district court did not err in determining the petition was not properly filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court. See NRS 34.738(1) (providing that a habeas petition that challenges the validity of the conviction or sentence must be filed in the county in which the conviction occurred and all other petitions must be filed

SUPREME COURT NEVADA

(O) 1947A

in the county in which the petitioner is incarcerated). Thus, petitioner does not show this court's intervention by way of an extraordinary writ is warranted. See NRS 34.320; Cote H. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 124 Nev. 36, 39, 175 P.3d 906, 908 (2008); Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 944 (2004) (recognizing that a petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that writ relief is warranted). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.2

Gibbons, C.J.

J.

Atiglia, Stiglish

Douglas Sr.J

cc: Hon. Douglas W. Herndon, District Judge
The Law Office of Kristina Wildeveld & Associates
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

(O) 1947A

¹We express no opinion as to whether petitioner's challenge is properly brought in a postconviction petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging the computation of time served.

²The Honorable Michael Douglas, Senior Justice, participated in the decision of this matter under a general order of assignment.