## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

WILLIAM RIVERA,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK,
Respondent,
and
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 80391

FILED

JAN 3 1 2020

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. YOUNG
DEPUTY CLERK

## ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

In this original pro se petition for a writ of mandamus, petitioner appears to seek an order directing the district court to enter written orders regarding motions he has filed below.

Problematically, petitioner has not provided this court with exhibits or other documentation that would support his claims for relief. 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, without deciding the merits of the claims raised, we decline to exercise our original jurisdiction in this matter. See NRAP 21(b).

We reiterate that "[p]etitioner[] carr[ies] the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted." Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

Furthermore, we are confident that the district court will resolve all pending matters as expeditiously as its calendar permits. Accordingly, we ORDER the petition DENIED.1

Pickering , C.J

Hardesty, J.

Cadish

cc:

William Rivera Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Petitioner's failure to provide timely proof of service of the petition constitutes an additional basis upon which to deny relief. NRAP 21(a)(1).