


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

OUR NEVADA JUDGES, INC., A
NEVADA NON-PROFIT
CORPORATION,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
WASHOE; AND THE HONORABLE
KATHLEEN A. SIGURDSON,
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
COUNTY OF WASHOE AND ROBERT
A. CONRAD,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 89475

FILED

DEC 11 2024


ELIZABETH A. BRC.
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY: 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS


This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying a request for electronic coverage of civil proceedings. Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we conclude petitioner has not met its burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (observing that the party seeking writ relief bears the burden of showing such relief is warranted); *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 679, 818 P.2d 851, 851, 853 (1991) (recognizing that writ relief is an extraordinary remedy and this court has the sole discretion in determining whether to grant relief). Specifically, petitioner acknowledges that there will be no hearing in the underlying case for which petitioner could provide electronic coverage, and thus, the matter is moot. *See, e.g., Personhood Nev. v. Bristol*, 126 Nev. 599, 602, 245 P.3d

572, 574 (stating that this court's duty is "to resolve actual controversies by an enforceable judgment" and "not to render advisory opinions"). We are not persuaded that an exception to the mootness doctrine applies. *Id.* Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Pickering


_____, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Kathleen A. Sigurdson, District Judge
Luke A. Busby
Washoe County District Attorney
Washoe District Court Clerk