LUKE A. BUSBY, ESQ.
SBN 10319
316 California Ave.
Reno, Nevada 89509

[redacted]*vada Judges*

Electronically Filed
Oct 16 2026 01:01 PM
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

OUR NEVADA JUDGES, INC.,
a Nevada Non-Profit Corporation,
Petitioner,
Vs.

Case No.:

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE ROBERT TEUTON, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
Respondent,
LUBA GONZALEZ N/K/A LUBA SNOW A/K/A LUBA DACE; AND ENRIQUE IVAN VELAZQUEZ-GONZALEZ,
Real Parties in Interest.
_____/

D. Ct. Case: D-18-575860-D

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

COMES NOW, Our Nevada Judges, Inc., a Nevada Non-Profit Corporation (hereinafter "ONJ") by and through the undersigned counsel, and hereby files the following petition for writ of mandamus. This Petition is based on the following memorandum of points and authorities and on the petitioner's appendix (hereinafter 'PA') on file.

Docket 93467 Document 1389185

I. Routing Statement

This matter should be diverted to the Court of Appeals under Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure ("NRAP") 17(b) because it is not retained by the Supreme Court under NRAP 17(a) and it involves a single question of law.

II. NRAP 26.1 Disclosure

The undersigned counsel of record certifies that the following are persons and entities as described in NRAP 26.1(a) and must be disclosed. These representations are made in order that the Justices of this Court may evaluate possible disqualification and recusal.

Petitioner does not have a parent corporation. Luke Busby, Esq., is counsel for Petitioner.

The undersigned attorney is the only attorney appearing on behalf of Petitioner in this matter.

Dated this Oct 16, 2026

By: /s/ Luke Busby, Esq.

LUKE A. BUSBY, ESQ.
SBN 10319
316 California Ave.
Reno, Nevada 89509
775-453-0112

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	1
Parties	1
Jurisdiction & Standing	1
Relief Requested	2
Issues Presented	2
Reasons Why The Writ Should Issue	2
Conclusion	7
Verification	8
Certificate of Compliance	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abrams v. Sanson, 136 Nev. 83, 87, 458 P.3d 1062, 1067 (2020)	2
Del Papa v. Steffen, 112 Nev. 369, 374, 915 P.2d 245, 249 (1996)	2
Falconi v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 543 P.3d 92 (Nev. 2024)	2
Richmond Newspapers, 448 U. S. 525, 573 (1980)	5
Solid v. Eighth Judicial District Court, 133 Nev. 118, 393 P. 3d 666 (2017)	5, 6
State v. Schmit, 273 Minn. 78, 87-88, 139 N. W. 2d 800, 807 (1966)	5
Univ.& Cmty. Coll. Sys. of Nev. v. Nevadans for Sound Gov't, 120 Nev. 712,720, 100 P.3d 179, 186 (2004)	5
Valdez-Jimenez v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court of Nev., 136 Nev. 155, 158, 460 P.3d 976, 982 (2020)	6

Statutes and Court Rules

NRS 34.330	1
NRS 34.160	3
NRS 34.170	3
SCR 229	4
SCR 230	1
SCR 231	1
SCR 243	2

III. Summary

ONJ filed a request to provide electronic coverage of a civil proceeding in Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. D-18-575860-D. District Court Judge Heidi Almase granted the request. PA-010. District Court Judge Robert Teuton refused to honor his predecessor's request because it was his personal opinion and unwritten rule that a new request was warranted. Accordingly, Judge Teuton denied camera access. Because Judge Almase's order contained language consistent with SCR 230(1), and because Judge Teuton did not comply with SCR 231 in revoking camera access, a manifest abuse of discretion occurred.

This writ petition does not arise from objections or any record made by the parents in the domestic relations matter.

IV. Parties

Petitioner is Our Nevada Judges, a Nevada Non-Profit Corporation recognized by the IRS as a Section 501(c)(3) organization.

Respondent is District Court Judge Robert Teuton and the Eighth Judicial District Court.

Real Parties in Interest Luba Dace and Enrique Velazquez-Martinez are the natural parents, neither of which opposed camera access nor made any record on the issue.

V. Jurisdiction & Standing

This Court has original jurisdiction. Article 6, Section 4 of the Nevada Constitution. See also NRS 34.330.

VI. Relief Requested

Petitioner requests this Court issue a writ of mandamus directing Respondent to comply with Judge Almase's order allowing camera access.

VII. Issues Presented

Whether District Court Judge Robert Teuton abused his discretion in refusing to comply with Judge Almase's order, effectively violating SCR 231.

IX. Reasons Why the Writ Should Issue

Alexander Falconi was recognized by the *Falconi* Court as running[1] the "press organization," which is now incorporated as a Nevada Non-Profit Corporation, ONJ. *Falconi v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court,* 543 P.3d 92, 94 (Nev. 2024).

This Court has provided that a news reporter may only seek relief of a denial of camera access by extraordinary writ. SCR 243.

This Court has further ruled that participant conduct in proceedings are a matter of public interest. *Abrams v. Sanson,* 136 Nev. 83, 87, 458 P.3d 1062, 1067 (2020). Likewise, "[t]he operations of the courts and the

[1] ONJ has been recognized as a news reporter by Districts 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; and, the Court of Appeals and Supreme Court; and, the Commission on Judicial Discipline; and, the North Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Reno, Beatty, Pahrump, Dayton, Mesquite, Moapa Valley, Sparks, Goodsprings, Boulder City, and Virginia Justice Courts; and, the Reno, Las Vegas, and Henderson Municipal Courts.

judicial conduct of judges are matters of utmost public concern." *Del Papa v. Steffen*, 112 Nev. 369, 374, 915 P.2d 245, 249 (1996).

A writ of mandamus may be issued "to compel the performance of an act which the law especially enjoins as a duty resulting from an office, trust or station; or to compel the admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of a right or office to which the party is entitled and from which the party is unlawfully precluded by such inferior tribunal, corporation, board or person," when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy. NRS 34.160; NRS 34.170. "[T]he scope of the press's and public's access to courts is an important issue of law, as well as a substantial issue of public policy, warranting [] extraordinary consideration [because] direct appellate review is often not available to the press, and thus, writs for extraordinary relief may be necessary to challenge a denial of access." *Falconi,* 543 P.3d 92 at 95 (Nev. 2024).

On July 11, 2025, District Court Judge Heidi Almase granted Our Nevada Judges, Inc.'s request to provide comprehensive electronic coverage of the proceedings. PA-010. This order is consistent with SCR 230(1). On September 15, 2026, Judge Teuton refused to recognize Judge Almase's order on record for the motion hearing in D-18-575860-D. PA-015. To the extent Judge Almase's order allows coverage of "each and every hearing in the above-entitled case", such language is consistent with SCR 230(1) because the rule allows the waiver of filing the request and the order includes a reconsideration procedure. This language is consistent

with the district's interests because the Eighth Judicial District Court is covered extensively by the media and it preserves judicial resources to review and sign a single SCR 229(1)(c) news reporter's SCR 230(1) request. It is also consistent with due process concerns in that the order allows parties to file a motion for reconsideration, a procedure which has already proven adequate in allowing a challenge and record to be developed as it led to appellate review that resulted in the publication of *Solid v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, 133 Nev. 118, 393 P. 3d 666 (2017). Regardless, it is the prerogative of the Eighth Judicial District Court to develop forms it requires its SCR 229(1)(c) news reporters to sign, and it is unreasonable to expect those news reporters to intuit the personal, unwritten rules and opinions of a department, especially when those unwritten rules contravene a *bona fide*, signed, and filed order.

It is also troubling that Judge Teuton waited until the evening before the hearing to require the filing of a new SCR 230(1) request, especially given his pronouncement from the bench on the day of the hearing that he was denying camera access because the new request, that he asked to be submitted was untimely. PA-006-012. Real Parties In Interest did not object to camera coverage. Judge Teuton manifestly abused his discretion; either in refusing to recognize with Judge Almase's SCR 230(1) order allowing electronic coverage, or by failing to make the particularized findings revoking access as required under SCR 231.

"It is not unrealistic even in this day to believe that public inclusion affords citizens a form of legal education and hopefully promotes confidence in the fair administration of justice." *State v. Schmit*, 273 Minn. 78, 87-88, 139 N. W. 2d 800, 807 (1966). “Instead of acquiring information about trials by firsthand observation or by word of mouth from those who attended, people now acquire it chiefly through the print and electronic media. In a sense, this validates the media claim of functioning as surrogates for the public.” *Richmond Newspapers*, 448 U. S. 525, 573 (1980).

The hearing has already occurred. Generally, this Court decides only actual controversies and does not give opinions on moot questions or abstract issues. *Univ.& Cmty. Coll. Sys. of Nev. v. Nevadans for Sound Gov’t*, 120 Nev. 712,720, 100 P.3d 179, 186 (2004) quoting *NCAA v. University of Nevada*, 97 Nev. 56, 57, 624 P.2d 10, 10 (1981). However, where an issue is arguably moot, the Court should still consider such an issue “[I]f it involves a matter of widespread importance that is capable of repetition, yet evading review.” *Solid v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 133 Nev. at 120 (2017), quoting *Personhood Nev. v. Bristol*, 126 Nev. 599, 602, 245 P.3d 572, 574 (2010), citing *Traffic Control Servs. v. United Rentals*, 120 Nev. 168, 171-72, 87 P.3d 1054, 1057 (2004).

“The party seeking to overcome mootness must prove ‘that (1) the duration of the challenged action is relatively short, (2) there is a likelihood that a similar issue will arise in the future, and (3) the matter is important.’”

Valdez-Jimenez v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court of Nev., 136 Nev. 155, 158, 460 P.3d 976, 982 (2020) quoting *Bisch v. Las Vegas Metro. Police Dep't*, 129 Nev. 328, 334-35, 302 P.3d 1108, 1113 (2013). Had Judge Teuton vacated Judge Almase's order in advance or responded to an earlier email, ONJ could have arranged for a timely SCR 230(1) request. PA 001-004. Judge Teuton's actions essentially guaranteed mootness would be implicated. Under these circumstances, review under the mootness exception is appropriate.

As recognized in *Solid*, "...episodes on any future seasons, will present many of the same issues of widespread importance". *Solid v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 133 Nev. at 120 (2017). The issue of camera access in courtrooms is of significant public importance, touching on fundamental principles of judicial transparency and the public's right to access court proceedings. This case is particularly concerning as a judge relied upon his personal opinions and unwritten rules to disregard a predecessor-judge's orders and preclude cameras in the courtroom, rather than adhering to the objective standards set forth by this Court in SCR 230. ONJ's serial and clustered coverage policies, which require ongoing electronic coverage, are effective in fairly representing the bar and bench and maximizing the educational value to the viewers. Furthermore, ONJ has encountered the problem of mootness regarding camera access on

multiple occasions, as evidenced by Supreme Court Case Nos. 80033[2] and 87296[3].

For these reasons, ONJ respectfully requests that this Court apply the mootness exception and decide this case on its merits, thereby providing much-needed guidance on the proper application of rules governing camera access in courtrooms.

XI. Conclusion

Judge Teuton's denial is an arbitrary and capricious abuse of discretion that could impact policy decisions not only of ONJ but that of any other media outlet seeking camera access. A writ should issue.

DATED this Oct 16, 2026

By: /s/ Luke Busby, Esq.

LUKE A. BUSBY, ESQ.
SBN 10319
316 California Ave.
Reno, Nevada 89509

[redacted]

[2] District Court focused on the non-consent of the attorneys, in violation of SCR 240, and ultimately failed to cite any particularized findings.

[3] District Court's denial categorically barred camera access to the evidentiary portion of a trial and was lacking in particularized findings.

VERIFICATION OF ALEXANDER FALCONI

I, Alexander M. Falconi, state that I am the Founding Director of Our Nevada Judges, Inc., and that I have read this *Petition* and that the contents are true and correct of my own personal knowledge, except for those matters I have stated that are not of my own personal knowledge, but that I only believe them to be true, and as for those matters, I do believe they are true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED this Oct 16, 2026



Alexander M. Falconi
Our Nevada Judges, Inc.

[redacted]

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I, Luke Busby, declare and certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5), and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Google Docs in 14-point Helvetica. I further certify that this brief complies with the type-volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by NRAP 32(a)(7)(C), it is proportionally spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more and contains 2340 words.

EXECUTED this Oct 16, 2026

By: /s/ Luke Busby, Esq.
LUKE A. BUSBY, ESQ.
SBN 10319
316 California Ave.
Reno, Nevada 89509

[redacted]

NRAP 25(5)(c)(1)(B) Certificate of Service

I, Luke Busby, do hereby declare that I served a true and correct copy of this *Petition* by placing it into a sealed envelope and mailing it, postage prepaid, *via* United States Postal Service, addressed as follows:

The Hon. Robert Teuton
Eighth Judicial District Court
601 N. Pecos Road
Reno, NV 89155

Maria Rios Landin, Esq.
[redacted] Ste. 150M
[redacted]

Luba Dace
[redacted] Street
[redacted]

… and *via* email to: [redacted]

SERVED this Oct 16, 2026

By: /s/ Luke Busby, Esq.
LUKE A. BUSBY, ESQ.
SBN 10319
316 California Ave.
Reno, Nevada 89509

[redacted]