IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHAD WINDHAM MITCHELL,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CARSON CITY,
Respondent.

No. 84693

FILED

JUN 30 2022

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This original pro se petition for a writ of mandamus seeks a writ directing the district court to file his "petition for a court order".

A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion. See NRS 34.160; Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Judicial Dist. Court, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). Whether a petition for extraordinary writ relief will be entertained rests within this court's sound discretion. D.H. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 123 Nev. 468, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736-37 (2007). Petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted. Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). Further, it is petitioner's responsibility to provide this court with all documents essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition. NRAP 21(a)(4).

Problematically, petitioner has not provided this court with exhibits or other documentation that would support his claims for relief.

See NRAP 21(a)(4) (providing the petitioner shall submit an appendix

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

containing all documents "essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition"). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.1

Parraguirre J.

Hardesty J.

Stiglich, J.

cc: Chad Windham Mitchell Carson City District Attorney Carson City Clerk

¹Accordingly, we take no action on appellant's pro per letters filed on May 17, 2022, May 25, 2022, and June 7, 2022.