

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ADELE JETER-WHEATON, A/K/A
ADELE ETER, A/K/A AJW JETER
TRUST,
Petitioner,

vs.

GREENPOINT MORTGAGE FUNDING,
AND ITS SUCCESSORS AND OR
ASSIGNS AND/OR SUCCESSORS IN
INTEREST; U.S. BANK NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION; NEVADA REAL
ESTATE SERVICES, INC.; REO/ASSET
MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT; OLD
REPUBLIC, A/K/A OLD REPUBLIC
HOLDING, T. D. SERVICE COMPANY,
BEING UNDISCLOSED MORTGAGE
AGGREGATORS (WHOLESALERS),
MORTGAGE ORIGINATORS, LOAN
SELLER(S), TRUSTEE OF POOLED
AND/OR BUNDLED ASSETS,
TRUSTEE FOR HOLDERS OF
CERTIFICATE OF COLLATERALIZED
MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS,
Respondents.

No. 53646

FILED

JUN 04 2009

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR
WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS


This original proper person for a writ of prohibition or mandamus appears to challenge various actions by several courts, including a federal bankruptcy court, concerning the foreclosure of a residence in which petitioner claims an interest.


The writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires or to control a manifest abuse of discretion. See NRS 34.160; Round Hill Gen. Imp. Dist. v. Newman, 97 Nev. 601, 637


P.2d 534 (1981). The writ of mandamus's counterpart, the writ of prohibition, is available to arrest the proceedings of a district court exercising its judicial functions, when such proceedings are in excess of the district court's jurisdiction. NRS 34.320. Both mandamus and prohibition are extraordinary remedies, however, and whether a petition will be considered is within our discretion. The petitioner bears the burden to demonstrate that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted. Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

Having considered the petition and its attachments, we are not persuaded that extraordinary relief is warranted, and we therefore deny the petition. NRAP 21(b); Smith, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851. In particular, the petition is largely incomprehensible, and to the extent that petitioner's allegations can be discerned, she appears to primarily challenge the bankruptcy court's dismissal of her bankruptcy petition; this court has no jurisdiction over a federal bankruptcy court. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, J.
Cherry


_____, J.
Saitta


_____, J.
Gibbons

cc: Adele Jeter-Wheaton