


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

VAN MARSHALL,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA; AND AARON
D. FORD,
Respondents.

No. 87655

FILED

DEC 22 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR
PROHIBITION*


This pro se original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition appears to seek to enforce petitioner's right to a speedy trial.

This court has original jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus and prohibition, 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). An appeal is generally an adequate remedy precluding writ relief. *Id.* at 224, 88 P.3d at 841. Even when an appeal is not immediately available because the challenged order is interlocutory in nature, the fact that the order may ultimately be challenged on appeal from a final judgment generally precludes writ relief. *Id.* at 225, 88 P.3d at 841.

Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. To begin, petitioner has not supplied an appendix with all records that may be essential to understanding the petition, including copies of any written district court

orders denying petitioner relief. *See Rust v. Clark Cnty. Sch. Dist.*, 103 Nev. 686, 689, 747 P.2d 1380, 1382 (1987) (explaining that written orders signed and filed by the district court are 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). In addition, petitioner has not demonstrated that he lacks a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹


_____, C.J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Herndon

cc: Van Marshall
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹Given this order, we take no action on petitioner's November 8, 2023, notice of special appearance of additional private attorney of record.