

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRYAN PHILLIP BONHAM,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK,  
Respondent.

No. 84406

**FILED**

**APR 14 2022**

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. L. [Signature]  
DEPUTY CLERK


*ORDER DENYING PETITION*


This pro se original petition seeks a writ of mandamus compelling the district court to supply petitioner free copies of written orders regarding petitioner's motion to correct illegal sentence and petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary and discretionary intervention is warranted. See NRS 34.170; *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (petitioners bear the burden to demonstrate that extraordinary relief is warranted).

Petitioner has not demonstrated that he requested and was denied free copies by the district court in the first instance. See NRAP 21(a)(4) (providing that the petitioner shall submit an appendix containing all documents "essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition"). Even assuming the relief sought here could be properly obtained through a petition for writ relief, any application for such relief should first be directed to and resolved by the district court. See *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 *Attorney Gen. v. Gypsum Res.*, 129 Nev. 23, 33-34, 294 P.3d 404, 410-11 (2013).<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.<sup>2</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Parraguirre

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Hardesty

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Stiglich

cc: Bryan Phillip Bonham  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>To the extent the district court has not yet issued a written order regarding petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus, this court is confident the district court will issue a written ruling as expeditiously as its calendar permits.

<sup>2</sup>Petitioner's March 18, 2022, "Notice of Motion/Petition" is denied.