## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

## MARYANN DECKER, Petitioner,

vs. THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE, THE HONORABLE BRIDGET ROBB PECK, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents, and NANCY ROBERTS, Real Party in Interest. No. 47874

FILED DEC 11 2006

## ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order granting real party in interest's request for an extension of time to serve petitioner in the underlying case.

A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station,<sup>1</sup> or to control a manifest abuse of discretion.<sup>2</sup> The counterpart to a writ of mandamus, a writ of prohibition is available when a district court

<sup>1</sup><u>See</u> NRS 34.160.

<sup>2</sup>See Round Hill Gen. Imp. Dist. v. Newman, 97 Nev. 601, 637 P.2d 534 (1981).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

06-25206

acts without or in excess of its jurisdiction.<sup>3</sup> Both mandamus and prohibition are extraordinary remedies, and it is within this court's discretion to determine if a petition will be considered.<sup>4</sup> Having considered this petition, we are not satisfied that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted. Accordingly, we deny the petition.<sup>5</sup>

It is so ORDERED.

J. Becker J. Hardestv J. Parraguirre

cc: Second Judicial District Court Dept. 7, District Judge David L. Riddle & Associates Lawrence D. Wishart Washoe District Court Clerk

<sup>3</sup><u>State of Nevada v. Dist. Ct. (Anzalone)</u>, 118 Nev. 140, 146-47, 42 P.3d 233, 237 (2002); NRS 34.320.

<sup>4</sup>See Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991).

<sup>5</sup>See NRAP 21(b); Smith, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA