

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JOHN STEVEN OLAUSEN,  
Petitioner,  
vs.  
THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR CARSON CITY, AND,  
THE HONORABLE MICHAEL R.  
GRIFFIN, DISTRICT JUDGE,  
Respondents.

No. 48192

**FILED**

DEC 11 2006

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

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR  
WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original proper person petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition requests this court, among other things, to instruct the district court to grant petitioner's motion for an enlargement of time to oppose a motion to dismiss and appears to request that this court direct the district court to vacate a determination concerning prosecutorial immunity.

Both mandamus and prohibition are extraordinary remedies, and it is within this court's discretion to determine if a petition will be considered.<sup>1</sup> It is petitioner's burden, moreover, to demonstrate that this court's extraordinary intervention is warranted.<sup>2</sup>

After reviewing this petition, we conclude that petitioner has failed to demonstrate that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted. We further note that appellant appears

---

<sup>1</sup>See Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991).

<sup>2</sup>Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

to have an adequate and speedy legal remedy in the form of an appeal from any adverse final judgment entered in the underlying action.<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, we deny the petition.<sup>4</sup>

It is so ORDERED.<sup>5</sup>

Becker, J.  
Becker

Hardesty, J.  
Hardesty

Parraguirre, J.  
Parraguirre

Cc: Hon. Michael R. Griffin, District Judge  
John Steven Olausen  
Attorney General George Chanos/Carson City  
Washoe County District Attorney Richard A. Gammick/Civil  
Division  
Carson City Clerk

---

<sup>3</sup>See Pan, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841.

<sup>4</sup>NRAP 21(b); Smith, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849.

<sup>5</sup>Although petitioner was not granted leave under NRAP 46(b) to file documents in proper person, we have received and considered his motions requesting in forma pauperis status and a stay, which he submitted with his petition on October 10, 2006. Accordingly, the clerk of this court shall file these two documents. As regards the in forma pauperis motion, we conclude that petitioner has demonstrated good cause to waive the filing fee in this writ proceeding, see NRAP 21(e); therefore, we grant petitioner's motion—no filing fee is due. And in light of this order, we deny as moot petitioner's request for a stay.