IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RAYMOND GEAN PADILLA,
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. 80936

FILED

APR 1 6 2020

ELIZABETHA BROWN

CLERKOF JUPHENE COURT

BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

In this original pro se petition, petitioner seeks a writ of mandamus directing the district court to vacate its order denying petitioner's civil complaint, in which petitioner contended that NDOC failed to provide him appropriate medical care for a skin condition he has had since birth that causes him pain and discomfort.¹

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

¹In light of this disposition, we also deny petitioner's motion to exceed legal copy limits as moot.

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.2

Pickering, C.J

Hardesty, J.

Cadish

cc: Raymond Gean Padilla
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

²Petitioner's failure to provide timely proof of service of the petition also constitutes an additional basis upon which to deny relief. NRAP 21(a)(1).