

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAIME MENDOZA,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK  
AND THE HONORABLE TIERRA  
DANIELLE JONES, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and


THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Real Party in Interest.

No. 90267

**FILED**

APR 18 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK


*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS*

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus that seeks an order compelling the district court to reassign petitioner's case to the department in which it was originally assigned. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Tierra Danielle Jones, Judge.

Having considered the petition and supporting documents, including the transcripts of proceedings, we are not persuaded that Mendoza has demonstrated that our discretionary, extraordinary intervention is warranted. *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (providing that this court has sole discretion in determining if a writ petition will be considered); *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (explaining that petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted). Having considered the unique circumstances of this case, we cannot say that the district court manifestly abused its considerable discretion in reassigning this case from Department 8 to Department 28 pursuant to


Nevada Rule of Criminal Practice 2(1)(B). *State v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. (Armstrong)*, 127 Nev. 927, 931-32, 267 P.3d 777, 779-80 (2011). N.R.Cr.P. 2(1) provides that “defendant shall be randomly assigned to a department of the court and shall remain such department until final disposition of the action, unless . . . (B) assigned as ordered by the chief judge consistent with a plan of court-wide case management.” Here, the court corrected its apparent initial erroneous assignment and reassigned petitioner’s case consistent with its plan of court-wide case management, as memorialized in EJDC 1.60(a). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.<sup>1</sup>



, C.J.

Herndon



J.

Parraguirre



J.

Stiglich

cc: Hon. Tierra Danielle Jones, District Judge  
Nobles & Yanez Law Firm  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>Given our disposition, we deny as moot Mendoza’s motion for stay of the district court proceedings. We further vacate the April 1, 2025, order directing the State, on behalf of respondents, to file an answering brief and petitioner to file a reply.