## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JOHN LUCKETT, Petitioner, vs. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents.

No. 87107

## FILED

OCT 18 2023 ELIZABETH A. BROWN CLERK OF SUPREME COURT DEPONY CLERK

## ORDER RETURNING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSING CASE

This pro se petition for a writ of mandamus appears to challenge a district court order denying a motion for relief under NRCP 60(b)(3) and a minute order issued on June 14, 2023.

On December 9, 2010, this court entered an order declaring petitioner a vexatious litigant and restricting his filing privileges. See Luckett v. Eighth Judicial District Court, Docket No. 55189 (Order Declaring Petitioner a Vexatious Litigant and Restricting Filing Privileges, December 9, 2010). That order provided that "petitioner may not file any original pro se writ petitions with this court, without payment of the filing fee, absent leave of the Chief Justice." Before a petition is filed, the order explained, "petitioner must submit a copy of the proposed petition, an application for in forma pauperis status that accurately reflects petitioner's current financial status and explains why the fee should be waived, and a motion for leave to file the documents, explaining briefly and clearly why an appeal is not an adequate remedy." Id.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

On August 9, 2023, this court received petitioner's motion for leave to file the writ petition, proposed petition for writ of mandamus, and application to proceed in forma pauperis. Having considered the documents submitted, we conclude that petitioner has not satisfied the requirements set forth in this court's December 9, 2010, order. Specifically, he has not shown that an appeal is an inadequate remedy at law to challenge the district court orders identified in petition, and he has not provided proof that the proposed petition for a writ of mandamus was served on any opposing party. See NRAP 25; NECFR 9.

Accordingly, we direct the clerk of this court to return the petition and to administratively close this case.<sup>1</sup>

It is so ORDERED.

Stiglich C.J.

cc: John Luckett Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

2

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>To the extent petitioner challenges the district court's denial of his peremptory challenge against the presiding district judge, we rejected this contention in *Luckett v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, Docket No. 87034 (Order Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus, September 26, 2023).