

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LATONIA SMITH,  
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;  
FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.; AND  
WADE BEAVERS,  
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 81358

**FILED**

JUL 21 2020

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS*

This original pro se petition, which we have construed as a petition for a writ of mandamus, seeks an order directing the district court to reopen and stay petitioner's civil case in A-19-803954-C.

Problematically, petitioner has not provided this court with all of the exhibits or documentation that would support her 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).

Accordingly, we deny the petition.

It is so ORDERED.<sup>1</sup>

                    Pickering                    , C.J.  
Pickering

                    Hardesty                    , J.  
Hardesty

                    Stiglich                    , J.  
Stiglich

cc: Latonia Smith  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Eighth District Court Clerk

<sup>1</sup>In light of this order, we deny petitioner's request for "notice and additional time to re-fashion the certificates" as moot.