

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MATTHEW WALKER,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE HONORABLE MARY PERRY,
JUDGE OF THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL
DISTRICT COURT,
Respondent,
and
TRISHA KRIEGHOFF,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 89671

FILED

DEC 17 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus, or in the alternative, prohibition challenging a district court order denying a petition to establish visitation pursuant to NRS 125C.050.


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 Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 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 Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004). An appeal is generally an adequate remedy precluding writ relief, and writ relief is not available to correct an untimely notice of appeal. *Id.* at 224-25, 88 P.3d at 841.


Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we are not persuaded that writ relief is warranted. The documents in petitioner's appendix indicate that the district court order petitioner now

challenges is a final appealable order, NRAP 3A(b)(1), and petitioner has not demonstrated that he lacks an adequate remedy at law by way of appeal. *Pan*, 120 Nev. at 224-25, 88 P.3d at 841.

Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Herndon

cc: Hon. Mary D. Perry, District Judge, Family Division
Matthew B. Walker
Raich Law PLLC
Eighth District Court Clerk