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. 80937

FILED APR 15 2020 ELIZABETH A. BROWN CLERKOPSUPREME COURT BY OF ALL OF A

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original pro se petition for a writ of mandamus seeks a writ directing the district court to dismiss a criminal case against petitioner, with prejudice, based upon petitioner's allegations of prosecutorial and procedural misconduct.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 21(b).

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

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

We note that "petitioner[] 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). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.²

J.

Pickering C.J. Pickering

dest

Hardesty

Cadish

J.

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).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A