

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

EBEN ROGERS,  
Petitioner,

vs.

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

No. 78329

FILED

MAY 15 2018


ELIZABETH A. RYAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY  DEPUTY CLERK


*ORDER DENYING PETITION*

This petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying a petition to terminate sex offender registration. Petitioner argues that a stipulation to continue his classification as a Tier 1 sex offender made during litigation challenging sex offender registration mandates that he be relieved of the duty to register as a sex offender pursuant to NRS 179D.490(2) (setting forth a 15-year period for registration as a Tier 1 sex offender). We decline to exercise original jurisdiction in this matter because petitioner has not supported his assertion regarding the stipulation. See NRS 34.160; NRAP 21(a)(4). Although petitioner argues that the unqualified language of the stipulation “maintains Petitioner’s status as a Tier 1 offender,” petitioner has not included a copy of a stipulation referencing a tier level. Rather, petitioner relies upon and provides a copy of a stipulation entered into in state litigation staying the state court proceedings pending the outcome of litigation in federal court,

which does not support his assertion regarding the tier level.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly,  
we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Stiglich

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Silver

cc: Hon. Adriana Escobar, District Judge  
Gary A. Modafferi  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>Petitioner clarified in the proceedings below that he is not a party to the federal litigation and that the federal litigation involved lifetime supervision. Further, letters referencing an agreement regarding implementation of A.B. 579 do not sufficiently support petitioner's assertion regarding the scope of the stipulation.