


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MICHAEL PETRAMALA,
Petitioner,
vs.
NANCY USIGBE,
Respondent.

No. 88795

FILED

JUN 11 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND EMERGENCY STAY*


This emergency pro se petition seeks a writ of mandamus declaring the stay/costs bond requirement of NRS 40.385 unconstitutional, directing the justice court to allow him to file an appeal without the bond, and staying a June 11, 2024, eviction appeal hearing.¹

Having considered the petition, we conclude that petitioner has not met his burden to demonstrate that this court's extraordinary intervention is warranted. *See Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) ("Petitioners carry the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted."); *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (recognizing that writ relief is an extraordinary remedy and that this court has sole discretion in determining whether to entertain a writ petition). In particular, petitioner has not supported his petition with an appendix that includes "a copy of any order or opinion, parts of the record, . . . or any other original document that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition," as required


¹Petitioner has filed a copy of his justice court application and order to proceed in forma pauperis. We construe this filing as a motion to proceed in forma pauperis in this writ proceeding, grant the motion, and waive the filing fees. NRAP 21(g).

by NRAP 21(a)(4). Without these documents, this court is not in a position to grant extraordinary writ relief. For example, petitioner claims that on May 23, 2024, the justice court returned unfiled his notice of appeal from a venue order because he did not pay the \$250 costs bond under NRS 40.385 even though he is proceeding with in forma pauperis status. But he provided no documentation in support of this claim, and from what is available from the justice court's online docket entries, it appears that a notice of appeal may have been filed on May 23, 2024, and a district court remittitur and order dismissing the appeal for lack of jurisdiction may have been filed on May 30. Further, it is unclear what June 11 hearing, in which case, petitioner is seeking to have stayed. Additionally, we note that petitioner failed to name the justice court as a party to this petition. See NRAP 21(a)(1) and (2). As a result, we are unable to fully consider the petition and

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Pickering


_____, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Michael Petramala
Nancy Usigbe