

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

COREY B. JOHNSON,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 83081

FILED

JAN 14 2022

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


This is a pro se appeal from a district court order denying a petition for a writ of mandamus and a petition for judicial review.¹ Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Susan Johnson, Judge.

In his petitions, appellant challenged the revocation of his parole. However, neither a petition for a writ of mandamus nor a petition for judicial review are the appropriate vehicles in which to challenge the decision to revoke parole because a petition for a writ of habeas corpus is an available legal remedy. See NRS 34.170 (providing that mandamus relief is not available when there is a plain, speedy and adequate legal remedy); NRS 34.020(2) (providing that the writ of review is not available where there is a plain, speedy and adequate remedy); see also NRS 34.360 (“Every person unlawfully committed, detained, confined or restrained of his or her liberty, under any pretense whatever, may prosecute a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the cause of such imprisonment or restraint.”); *Hornback v. Warden*, 97 Nev. 98, 100, 625 P.2d 83, 84 (1981) (parole

¹This appeal has been submitted for decision on the record without briefing or oral argument. NRAP 34(f)(3), (g); see also NRAP 31(d)(1); *Luckett v. Warden*, 91 Nev. 681, 682, 541 P.2d 910, 911 (1975).

revocation challenge raised in petition for writ of habeas corpus). Therefore, the district court did not err in denying these petitions. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.

 C.J.
Parraguirre

 J.
Hardesty

 J.
Pickering

cc: Hon. Susan Johnson, District Judge
Corey B. Johnson
Attorney General/Carson City
Attorney General/Las Vegas
Eighth District Court Clerk