IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SEAN EDWARD DOUGLAS,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE BILL HENDERSON, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
GULDJIAM LAW APC.; CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION; NEVADA DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICES; AND GEICO SECURE INSURANCE COMPANY,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 92670

FILED

JUN 03 2026

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

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This petition for a writ of mandamus seeks to compel the immediate turnover of settlement proceeds held in trust by petitioner's personal injury counsel, compel the production of certain related documents, stay any collection of the proceeds, return any distributed funds with interest, and impose sanctions against any party who willfully withheld funds. Petitioner's requests arise from a child support income withholding order attached to the settlement proceeds preventing their immediate distribution to him; petitioner appears to primarily assert that

26-25114

the income withholding order is invalid and that no other authority exists for withholding the settlement proceeds. Petitioner has also filed motions seeking emergency consideration, immediate turnover, and a stay of disbursement.

Whether a petition seeking mandamus relief will be considered by this court is purely discretionary, *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851-52 (1991), and it is the petitioner's burden to demonstrate that writ relief is warranted, *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we conclude that petitioner has not met his burden to demonstrate that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. Even if the relief sought here could be properly obtained through a petition for writ relief, *see* NRS 34.160, any application for such relief should be made to the district court in the first instance so that factual and legal issues may be fully developed, giving this court an adequate record to review. *See Round Hill Gen. Imp. Dist. v. Newman*, 97 Nev. 601, 604, 637 P.2d 534, 536 (1981) (recognizing that "an appellate court is not an appropriate forum in which to resolve disputed questions of fact" and determining that when there are factual issues presented, this court will not exercise its discretion to entertain a petition for extraordinary relief); *State v. County of Douglas*, 90 Nev. 272, 276-77, 524 P.2d 1271, 1274 (1974) (noting that "this court prefers that such an application [for writ relief] be addressed to the discretion of the appropriate district court" in the first instance), *abrogated on other grounds by Att'y Gen. v. Gypsum Res.*, 129 Nev. 23, 33-34, 294 P.3d 404, 410-11 (2013). Although petitioner named the Eighth Judicial District Court and a judge thereof as respondents, he has

not demonstrated that he first sought relief regarding the withholding order from the district court. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.[1]

_____, J.
Stiglich

_____, J.
Cadish

_____, J.
Lee

cc: Hon. Bill Henderson, District Judge, Family Division
Sean Edward Douglas
Clark County District Attorney Family Support Division
Geico Secure Insurance Company
Guldjiam Law APC.
Nevada Division of Social Services
Eighth District Court Clerk

[1]Petitioner's motions for expedited consideration, immediate turnover, and a stay of disbursement are denied as moot.