

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GRANT ROGERS,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
LINDA MARQUIS, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
MARY ROGERS,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 75729

FILED

MAY 04 2018

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION*

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges the district court's failure to enter a decree of divorce immediately after trial and the court's perpetuation of a temporary support order until the decree is entered.

Having reviewed the petition and supporting documents, we are not convinced that our extraordinary intervention is warranted at this time. NRS 34.160; NRS 34.320; *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (recognizing that petitioners bear the burden to demonstrate that writ relief is warranted); *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). Petitioner has not detailed in the petition his alleged inability to pay the court-ordered temporary support or explained how the court's order otherwise abridged his religious freedoms, and he failed to submit with the appendix all documentation necessary to evaluate the issues raised in the petition, including copies of the motion for interim support and opposition thereto,

the transcript of the hearing on that motion, and the opposition to the motion for reconsideration. See NRAP 21(a)(3), (4) (requiring petitioners to state the facts necessary to understand the issues and the reasons why the writ should issue, including points and legal authorities, and to submit with the petition copies of any parts of the record or any document that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition); *Pan*, 120 Nev. 222, 228-29, 88 P.3d at 844. Moreover, at the trial's conclusion on April 24, 2018, the district court directed the parties to prepare and submit proposed orders within 10 days. We expect that the parties will timely comply and the district court will thereafter resolve the matter before it with all due haste. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Silver


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Linda Marquis, District Judge, Family Court Division
Patricia A. Marr
The Abrams & Mayo Law Firm
Eighth District Court Clerk