

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAMES M. LAITY,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; THE HONORABLE JERRY A.
WIESE, CHIEF JUDGE OF THE
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT;
THE HONORABLE NADIN CUTTER,
JUDGE OF THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL
DISTRICT COURT, FAMILY DIVISION,
DEPARTMENT T; AND THE
HONORABLE MARK R. DENTON,
JUDGE OF THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL
DISTRICT COURT, DEPARTMENT 13,
Respondents,


and

TIA LAITY,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 90989

FILED

AUG 05 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION


This petition for a writ of prohibition seeks an order prohibiting respondents from proceeding in the underlying district court case. Petitioner also asks that respondent judges be disqualified and referred to the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline, that the case be reassigned outside of the Eighth Judicial District Court, for an emergency stay of the district court proceedings, for restoration of the docket, and for temporary physical custody of the parties' minor child.

Petitioner's July 22, July 30, and August 4, 2025, motions for leave to supplement the petition and record are granted.¹ However, after reviewing the materials submitted by petitioner, we conclude that petitioner has not met his burden of demonstrating that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (explaining that petitioners bear the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted); *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (stating that this court has sole discretion in determining if a writ petition will be considered); see NRAP 21(a)(4). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Herndon


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Stiglich

¹The August 4 supplement updates the record to show that petitioner filed a notice of intent to withhold scheduled custody exchange in the district court on August 1, 2025, which is where custody decisions must be initiated. Petitioner also provided a video link in his supplement, but as the district court apparently has not had an opportunity to first review petitioner's notice and any accompanying motion and video and to make it part of the district court record, that video is not properly before this court at this time.

cc: Hon. Jerry A. Wiese, Chief Judge
Hon. Mark R. Denton, District Judge
Hon. Nadin Cutter, District Judge, Family Division
James Michael Laity
Gastelum Law
Eighth District Court Clerk