



IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SALVATORE CARRERA,
Petitioner,

v.

THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
WASHOE; AND THE HONORABLE
SANDRA A. UNSWORTH, DISTRICT
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

LORI ANN PETERSON,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 92950-COA

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This is a pro se petition for a writ of mandamus seeking a writ directing the district court to hold a hearing on petitioner's motion to enforce a prior order in a child custody matter. A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, NRS 34.160, or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion, *Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). The decision to entertain a petition for extraordinary writ relief is within our sole discretion, and the petitioner has the burden of demonstrating that such relief is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). Having considered the petition and the supporting documents, we conclude that petitioner has not carried his burden

of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted at this time.¹
Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.²



Bulla, C.J.



Gibbons, J.



Westbrook, J.

cc: Salvatore Carrera
Lori Ann Peterson
The Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the
County of Washoe
Hon. Sandra A. Unsworth, District Judge

¹We note that the appeal addressed by the district court in its March 10, 2026, order holding certain motions in abeyance pending outcome of the appeal has been resolved, with remittitur returning jurisdiction to the district court on September 9. *Carrera v. Peterson*, Docket No. 91367-COA, 2026 WL 2287923 (Ct. App. Aug. 6, 2026) (Order of Affirmance); *see also Mack-Manley v. Manley*, 122 Nev. 849, 858, 138 P.3d 525, 531-32 (2006) (providing that a district court retains jurisdiction to enforce its orders while an appeal is pending because enforcement is collateral to appellate issues). We are confident that the district court will conduct further proceedings as expeditiously as the court's calendar permits.

²In light of this order, we deny as moot petitioner's remaining motions. As to petitioner's motion regarding misrepresentation, the filing that motion challenges was struck by this court and not considered when resolving this petition.