


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRADLEY GUY,
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,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 88066

FILED

FEB 26 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION


This original pro se petition for a writ of mandamus challenges an amended judgment of conviction. A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station, or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion. *See* NRS 34.160; *Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). Whether a petition for extraordinary writ relief will be entertained rests within this court's sound discretion. *D.H. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 123 Nev. 468, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736-37 (2007). Petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). Further, it is petitioner's responsibility to provide this court with all documents essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition. NRAP 21(a)(4).

Problematically, petitioner has not provided this court with 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"). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Herndon

cc: Bradley Guy
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk