IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GARY E. MCKINLEY,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK,
Respondent,
and
CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT
ATTORNEY; HENDERSON POLICE
DEPARTMENT; AND THE STATE OF
NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 82175

FILED

FEB 08 2021

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION AND AMENDED PETITION

This original pro se petition and amended petition for a writ of mandamus seek an order directing the real parties in interest to (1) comply with certain subpoenas and discovery requests, (2) allow and assist petitioner to electronically file documents and review discovery, (3) provide petitioner audio/video equipment to participate in district court hearings, and (4) permit petitioner to keep boxes of legal documents in his prison cell.

Petitioner has not provided this court with all of the 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"). Thus, we are not persuaded that petitioner has met his burden to show that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. See NRS 34.170; Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004)

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

("Petitioners carry the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted."); Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (observing that "the issuance of a writ of mandamus or prohibition is purely discretionary with this court"). Accordingly, we ORDER the petition and amended petition DENIED.

Parraguirre

cc: Gary E. McKinley Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Attorney General/Las Vegas Henderson City Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

(O) 1947A