IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BENJAMIN SHER,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
KENNETH E. POLLOCK, DISTRICT
JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
JESSICA POOLE,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 66128

FILED

SEP 16 2014

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 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 determining that real party in interest had standing to pursue a trust action.

This court may issue a writ of prohibition to arrest the proceedings of a district court exercising its judicial functions when such proceedings are in excess of the district court's jurisdiction. See NRS 34.320; Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). 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, or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion. See NRS 34.160; Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Judicial Dist. Court, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). It is within this court's sole discretion to determine if a writ petition will be considered. Smith, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851. Petitioner bears the burden of

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A 🚭

demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted. Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

Having considered petitioner's arguments and the documentation before this court, we conclude that our intervention by extraordinary writ relief is not warranted. See NRAP 21(b)(1); NRS 34.160; NRS 34.320; Pan, 120 Nev. at 228, 88 P.3d at 844; Smith, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Hardesty

Douglas

Cherry

cc: Hon. Kenneth E. Pollock, District Judge Prestige Law Group Goodsell & Olsen Eighth District Court Clerk