


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NATHAN MYPHRON WILLIAMS,
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,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 86254

FILED

MAR 30 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY: 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION


This is an original pro se pretrial petition for a writ of habeas corpus seeking the dismissal of criminal charges.


Petitioner does not allege that he previously sought and was denied habeas relief in the district court. *See* NRAP 22 (stating that “[a]n application for an original writ of habeas corpus should be made to the appropriate district court” in the first instance). A pretrial petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be filed in the district court in the first instance so that factual and legal issues are fully developed, giving this court an adequate record to review. *See Round Hill Gen. Improvement Dist. v. Newman*, 97 Nev. 601, 604, 637 P.2d 534, 536 (1981) (recognizing that “an appellate court is not an appropriate forum in which to resolve disputed questions of fact”); *State v. Cty. of Douglas*, 90 Nev. 272, 276-77, 524 P.2d 1271, 1274 (1974) (noting that “this court prefers that such an application [for writ relief] be addressed to the discretion of the appropriate district court” in the first instance), *abrogated on other grounds by Cortez Masto v. Gypsum Res.*, 129 Nev. 23, 33-34, 294 P.3d 404, 410-11 (2013).


Additionally, petitioner has not provided this court with any exhibits or documents in support of his claims and necessary for this court's consideration of the petition. *See* NRAP 21(a)(4) (providing that petitioner shall submit an appendix containing all documents "essential to understand[ing] the matters set forth in the petition").

Petitioner bears the burden of showing that extraordinary relief is warranted. *See Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). We conclude that petitioner has failed to demonstrate our intervention by extraordinary writ is warranted. Further, to the extent that petitioner has counsel, he must proceed by and through counsel of record. Therefore, we decline to exercise our original jurisdiction in this matter. *See* NRAP 21(b). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Herndon

cc: Nathan Myphron Williams
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Eighth District Court Clerk