

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ALI SHAHROKHI,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
MATHEW HARTER, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,


and

KIZZY BURROW,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 79992-COA

FILED

NOV 20 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION*

This emergency, original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition seeks an order (1) directing the district court to vacate its order from July 11, 2019, granting real party in interest permission to temporarily relocate with the parties' minor child, (2) mandating the child's immediate return to Nevada, and (3) directing reassignment of the case to a different department.

The issues and requests for relief that are raised in this petition were recently addressed in an order granting in part and denying in part petitioner's petition for a writ of mandamus in a separate matter. *Shahrokhi v. Dist. Court (Burrow)*, Docket No. 79336-COA (Order, November 6, 2019). Accordingly, the petition is moot. *Personhood Nevada v. Bristol*, 126 Nev. 599, 602, 245 P.3d 572, 574 (2010). To the extent that petitioner raises additional arguments and facts in support of his request for reassignment, petitioner has not demonstrated that he has filed a district court motion to disqualify the judge based on his allegations of bias,

19-47434

and we therefore decline to intervene at this time. *See, e.g., Archon Corp. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 133 Nev. 816, 822, 407 P.3d 702, 708 (2017) (noting that issues not raised below are rarely appropriate for writ review).

Accordingly, extraordinary writ relief is not warranted, *id.* at 821, 407 P.3d at 707 (explaining that considering a petition for writ relief is purely discretionary with this court, and petitioner bears the burden of showing that such relief is warranted), and we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Bulla

¹Appellant's November 15, 2019, motion to file the appendix under seal and to order transmittal of the child interview is granted in part. The district court record was sealed below; therefore, the clerk of this court shall detach and file the portions of the appendix provisionally received on November 15, 2019, that constitute district court records, specifically pages 1-21, 22-34, and 62-66, under seal. SRCR 7. The rest of the appendix shall be filed, but not under seal. In the future, appellant should separately submit any individual portions of an appendix that he requests be filed under seal. As the child interview is not necessary for our review of this writ petition, we deny appellant's motion to order its transmittal.

cc: Hon. Mathew Harter, District Judge
Ali Shahrokhi
Standish Law
Eighth District Court Clerk