IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

WILLIAM CARL MISIEWICZ,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK,
Respondent,
and,
THE STATE OF NEVADA BOARD OF
PAROLE COMMISSIONERS,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 85980

FILED

FEB 0 3 2023

ELIZABETH A. FROWN
STERK ON SUPREME COURT
BY
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This original pro se petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges the denial of parole.

Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary and discretionary intervention is warranted. See Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004) (explaining that the petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that writ relief is warranted); Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 679, 818 P.2d 849, 851, 853 (1991) (recognizing that writ relief is an extraordinary remedy, and that the issuance of such relief is purely discretionary).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

23-03415

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

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Stiglich

Cadish

Herndon

cc: William Carl Misiewicz Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk