IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROY DANIELS MORAGA,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK,
Respondent.

No. 85720



ORDER DENYING PETITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court minute order denying a motion for production of documents under the freedom of information act.

This court has original jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus, and the issuance of such extraordinary relief is solely within this court's discretion. See Nev. Const. art. 6, § 4; D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 123 Nev. 468, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736-37 (2007). Petitioner bears the burden to show that extraordinary relief is warranted, and such relief is proper only when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. See Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004). Here, petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law by way of filing a postconviction petition for such relief in the district court in the first instance. Thus, having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary intervention is warranted.

Additionally, while petitioner provided a copy of a minute order, he has not supplied a copy of a written district court order memorializing such ruling. See Rust v. Clark Cty. Sch. Dist., 103 Nev. 686, 689, 747 P.2d

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA



1380, 1382 (1987) (explaining that a written order signed and filed by the district court is essential to this court's review); see also NRAP 21(a)(4) (stating that it is the petitioner's obligation to provide an appendix that includes all records that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Hardesty, C.J

toway.

Parraguirre

Migline, J.

Stiglich

cc: Roy Daniels Moraga

Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk