

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

WILLIAM MACHADO,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
JERRY A. WIESE, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 81417

FILED

JUL 28 2020

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

*ORDER DENYING PETITION
FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION*

This petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order denying a motion to suppress.

We have reviewed the documents submitted in this matter and, without deciding upon the merits of any claims raised herein, we decline to exercise our original jurisdiction in this matter. See NRS 34.160; NRS 34.330; NRAP 21(b)(1); *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (“Petitioner[] carr[ies] the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted.”). Neither a writ of mandamus nor a writ of prohibition will issue when petitioner has a “plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law.” *Gumm v. State, Dep’t of Educ.*, 121 Nev. 371, 375, 113 P.3d 853, 856 (2005); NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330. Petitioner has not established that an eventual appeal does not afford an adequate legal remedy. *Pan*, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841 (“[T]he right to appeal is generally an adequate legal remedy that precludes

