## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

HUGO MARTINEZ REYES,
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. 81313

FILED

CLERICOF SUPREME COURT

## ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This is an original pro se petition that has been construed as a petition for a writ of mandamus seeking recusal of the district court judge and prosecutor in petitioner's criminal case.

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).

And, to the extent petitioner has counsel, he must proceed by and through that counsel. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.1

Pickering, C.J

1 Sardesty, J.

Stiglich

cc: Hugo Martinez Reyes

Hardesty

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).