## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FELTON L. MATTHEWS, JR., Petitioner,

VS.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE DONALD M. MOSLEY, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents, and THE STATE O

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Real Party in Interest.

FELTON L. MATTHEWS, JR., Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent.

No. 40709

FILED

MAR 0 3 2003



No. 40902

## **ORDER DENYING PETITIONS**

These are proper person petitions for a writ of mandamus or prohibition. We elect to consolidate these matters for disposition. We have considered the petitions on file herein, and we are not satisfied that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted at this time.<sup>1</sup>

Petitioner has filed numerous documents in this court raising substantially similar claims challenging the validity of his judgment of

<sup>1</sup>See NRS 34.160; NRS 34.170; NRS 34.320; NRS 34.330.

OF NEVADA

conviction and the proceedings in the district court.<sup>2</sup> In denying petitioner's petition for a writ of mandamus in Docket No. 40468, this court cautioned petitioner that a prisoner could forfeit all deductions of time earned by the prisoner if the court finds that the prisoner has filed a document in a civil action for an "improper purpose." Further, this court cautioned petitioner that his actions may constitute a major violation of the Code of Penal Discipline.<sup>4</sup> Petitioner's continuous stream of filings is

<sup>3</sup>NRS 209.451(1)(d).

<sup>4</sup>Nevada Code of Penal Discipline §III (D) (Major Violation #48) provides that the following is a major violation of the Code:

Any violation of the Rules of Court, contempt of court, submission of forged or otherwise false documents, submissions of false statements, violations of Rules of Civil Procedure, Criminal Procedure or Appellate Procedure and/or receiving sanctions and/or warnings for any such actions from any court. Although not necessary for disciplinary purposes, any Order from any court detailing such action shall be sufficient evidence for disciplinary purposes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Matthews v. District Court, Docket No. 40605 (Order Denying Petition, December 19, 2002); Matthews v. District Court, Docket No. 40568 (Order Denying Petition, December 12, 2002); Matthews v. District Court, Docket No. 40468 (Order Denying Petition, November 22, 2002); Matthews v. State, Docket No. 40299 (Order Denying Petition, October 15, 2002); Matthews v. State, Docket No. 40033 (Order Denying Petition, August 22, 2002); Matthews v. State, Docket No. 39885 (Order Denying Petition, July 30, 2002); Matthews v. State, Docket No. 39837 (Order Denying Petition, July 22, 2002); Matthews v. State, Docket No. 39014 (Order Denying Petition, January 22, 2002). Additionally, this court has dismissed four appeals filed by petitioner for lack of jurisdiction. Matthews v. State, Docket Nos. 38307, 38379, 38380 (Order Dismissing Appeals, October 1, 2001); Matthews v. State, Docket No. 38225 (Order Dismissing Appeal, August 30, 2001).

an abuse of this court's appellate and original jurisdiction. Petitioner's claims challenge district court proceedings that are the subject of an appeal currently pending in this court in Docket No. 39717. Petitioner is represented by counsel in that appeal. We conclude that under these circumstances, this court's consideration of proper person extraordinary writ petitions challenging the validity of petitioner's judgment of conviction is unwarranted. We again caution petitioner that he may be subject to disciplinary sanctions if he files documents for an improper purpose. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petitions DENIED.5

Shearing

Logriti

3eckel

J.

Becker

cc: Hon. Donald M. Mosley, District Judge
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Director, Department of Corrections
Robert L. Langford & Associates
Felton L. Matthews, Jr.
Clark County Clerk

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>We have considered all proper person documents filed or received in these matters, and we conclude that the relief requested is not warranted.