

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KRISTY HOLLINGSWORTH-OLSON,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE  
CYNTHIA GUILIANI, DISTRICT  
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

JASON ALLEN OLSON,  
Real Party in Interest.

No. 56005

**FILED**

**MAY 18 2010**

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. Young  
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR  
WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS


This original petition for a writ of prohibition or mandamus challenges a district court order that determined that Nevada has home-state jurisdiction to make child custody determinations and set, among other things, a temporary visitation schedule.


Having considered the petition and its attachments, we are not persuaded that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted at this time, NRAP 21(b)(1); Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991), because writ relief is not available when the petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law, such as an appeal challenging the district court's jurisdiction. NRS 34.170; 34.330; Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 88 P.3d 840 (2004). Further, while the visitation schedule is somewhat troubling, petitioner failed to demonstrate that our intervention is warranted at this time, as it appears that there

are only two weeks left in the temporary visitation schedule and a final visitation schedule will be established following the May 28 trial date, which may be appealed by the aggrieved party. See NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330; Valley Bank of Nevada v. Ginsburg, 110 Nev. 440, 874 P.2d 729 (1994). Accordingly, writ relief is not appropriate, and we

ORDER the petition DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Cherry

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Saitta

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Cynthia N. Giuliani, District Judge  
Wright Law Offices  
Carol A. Menninger  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that any party that is aggrieved may raise these issues in any appeal from the district court's judgment.

In light of this order, we deny as moot petitioner's request for a stay of the underlying proceedings.