IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ALFRED P. CENTOFANTI, III,
Appellant,

vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 78193

FILED

APR 0 2 2021

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS

This court denied appellant's petition for review and the remittitur issued on March 3, 2021. NRAP 41(b)(2). Appellant has filed two motions to recall the remittitur so that he may reopen this appeal and pursue additional remedies in state and federal court and a petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court. Appellant explains that he attempted to file a motion to stay the remittitur on March 5, 2021, but the remittitur had already issued. This court may only recall the remittitur "when inadvertence, mistake of fact, or an incomplete knowledge of the circumstances of the case on the part of the court or its officers, whether induced by fraud or otherwise, has resulted in an unjust decision." Wood v. State, 60 Nev. 139, 141, 104 P.2d 187, 188 (1940). The remittitur issued in the normal course. Appellant does not demonstrate good cause to recall the remittitur here. Accordingly, the motions are denied.

It is so ORDERED.1

1 Sardesty, C.J.

¹The clerk of this court shall return the documents received on March 17, 2021, to appellant, unfiled.

cc: Alfred P. Centofanti, III Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney