

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JO ANN JACKSON,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE NOEL
E. MANOUKIAN, SENIOR JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

SENIOR LAW CLERK MICHAEL
BUCHANAN,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 44876

FILED

DEC 23 2005

JANEITE M BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Richard*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING WRIT PETITION

This original proper person writ petition asks this court to remove all of the discovery reports from the district court record. Petitioner also accuses Senior Judge Noel Manoukian and the United States Postal Service (USPS) of fraud and asks this court to reverse Judge Manoukian's order dismissing petitioner's complaints in District Court Case Nos. A357614 and A366925.

Petitioner has attached a letter from the USPS indicating that it attempted to deliver a document to petitioner and left a notice of the attempted delivery on November 4, 2004. The letter further indicates that the document was not confirmed delivered until January 6, 2005. Petitioner has also provided her own affidavit, indicating that the delivered document contained discovery reports from the above-referenced district court cases, and asserting that she did not receive the reports until after her cases had been dismissed. Thus, petitioner contends that she

has demonstrated that the dismissal order is “full of fraud” and the USPS is interfering with her right to prosecute her cases.

A writ petition seeks an extraordinary remedy and is proper only when there is no plain, adequate and speedy legal remedy, or there are either urgent circumstances or important legal issues that need clarification.¹ Generally, the right to appeal is an adequate legal remedy, precluding writ relief.² Petitioner has the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted and must provide this court with a statement of facts necessary to understand all issues raised, and attach to her petition all documents, including copies of any orders, necessary for this court to render its decision.³

We have considered the petition and attached documents, and are not satisfied that this court’s intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted. In particular, other than petitioner’s conclusory statements and accusations, and the letter and affidavit showing that the USPS attempted to, and eventually did, deliver some reports to petitioner, she has provided nothing to support issuance of a writ of prohibition. Petitioner challenges a district court order that dismissed her complaints, but has failed to provide the order, assign any error to it, or even explain the basis for the dismissal. Moreover, because this petition challenges a

¹NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330; State, Div. Child & Fam. Servs. v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 445, 449, 92 P.3d 1239, 1242 (2004).

²Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 224-25, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004).

³NRAP 21(a); Pan, 120 Nev. at 228-29, 88 P.3d at 844 (noting that this court’s review in a writ proceeding is limited to the petition and accompanying documents and, therefore, if essential information is not provided, there is no way to properly evaluate the petition).

final, appealable order under NRAP 3A(b)(1), namely an order dismissing petitioner's complaints, writ relief is inappropriate.⁴ Accordingly, we deny the petition.⁵

It is so ORDERED.

Becker, C.J.
Becker

Maupin, J.
Maupin

Hardesty, J.
Hardesty

cc: Hon. Noel E. Manoukian, Senior Judge
Jo Ann Jackson
Carrie S. Bourdeau
Freeman Law Firm
Las Vegas City Attorney
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP
Clark County Clerk

⁴See Pan, 120 Nev. at 224-25, 88 P.3d at 841.

⁵NRAP 21(b); Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991).