

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAMIE COGBURN,  
Petitioner,  
vs.  
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE MARI  
D. PARLADE, DISTRICT COURT  
JUDGE,  
Respondents,  
and  
KRISTIN COGBURN,  
Real Party in Interest.

No. 91587-COA

**FILED**

**MAY 13 2026**

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

*ORDER DENYING PETITION*

Jamie Cogburn filed a petition for a writ of mandamus seeking an order directing the district court to enter a final written order resolving all issues in an ongoing family law proceeding, arguing that entry of a final order has been unreasonably delayed. Respondent Honorable Mari D. Parlade has answered the petition and asserts that Jamie and Kristin Cogburn, the real party in interest, have caused extensive delays in this matter by filing numerous motions and other documents in the district court and/or by failing to comply with the court's scheduling orders. Kristin has also responded to the petition.

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). Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, and

it is within the discretion of this court to determine if a petition will be considered. *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). The petitioner bears the burden to show that extraordinary relief is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

“The lower court has broad discretion in calendaring matters before it.” *Maheu v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 89 Nev. 214, 216-17, 510 P.2d 627, 629 (1973); *see also Happy Campers LLC v. Post & Pearl Props., LLC*, No. 84808, 2023 WL 7449409, at \*2 (Nev. Nov. 9, 2023) (Order of Affirmance) (“[A] district court has the inherent authority to control its own docket.”). Moreover, “[i]t is the clear responsibility of each individual trial judge to manage the individual calendar in an efficient and effective manner. Each judge is charged with the responsibility for maintaining a current docket.” EDCR 1.90(b)(1). “Where a district court is entrusted with discretion on an issue, the petitioner’s burden to demonstrate a clear legal right to a particular course of action by that court is substantial; we can issue traditional mandamus only where the lower court has manifestly abused that discretion or acted arbitrarily or capriciously.” *Walker v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 136 Nev. 678, 680, 476 P.3d 1194, 1196 (2020) (emphasis omitted).

Having considered Jamie’s petition, the responses from Kristin and Judge Parlade, and the documents before this court, we conclude that Jamie fails to demonstrate that our intervention by extraordinary writ relief is warranted. *See id.* The district court conducted a trial concerning the matters at issue in the parties’ divorce proceeding in 2024. It later issued a decree of divorce in which it declared the parties to be divorced and resolved the majority of the outstanding issues. However, the court directed

the parties to provide it with updated financial disclosure forms within seven days from the entry of the decree on November 1, 2024, so that it could enter an award of child support based on the parties' current incomes. See EDCR 5.704(a) (stating that "[o]nce a trial, motion, or other proceeding is completed, the court may request additional information or documentation").


The record before this court indicates that the parties thereafter filed numerous motions and additional documents, including motions to alter or amend the decree. In June 2025 Kristin filed a notice of appeal following entry of an order resolving several motions, but the appeal was later dismissed by the Nevada Supreme Court for lack of jurisdiction. See *Cogburn v. Cogburn*, No. 90875, 2026 WL 214769 (Nev. Jan. 26, 2026) (Order Dismissing Appeal).

After entry of the order dismissing the appeal, the district court set this matter for a hearing concerning the outstanding issues. Judge Parlade informs this court that, before that hearing, she received the necessary information and that she is in the process of drafting a written decision finally resolving all outstanding issues. In light of the foregoing, we decline to intervene and we are confident this matter will be resolved as expeditiously as the district court's docket permits. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Bulla

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Mari D. Parlade, District Judge  
Pecos Law Group  
Roger P. Croteau & Associates, Ltd.  
Attorney General/Las Vegas  
Eighth District Court Clerk