


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NICOLE CHRISTINE FOLLOWILL,  
Petitioner,  
vs.  
STATE OF NEVADA PAROLE BOARD  
OF COMMISSIONERS;  
COMMISSIONER LAMICIA BAILEY;  
COMMISSIONER ERIC  
CHRISTIANSEN; COMMISSIONER  
DONNA VERCHIO; COMMISSIONER  
SCOTT WEISENTHAL; AND  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, KATIE  
FRANKER,  
Respondents.

No. 86011

FILED

MAY 11 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION*


This original pro se petition for a writ of mandamus challenges the denial of parole to petitioner Nicole Christine Followill. Having considered this petition, we are not persuaded that our intervention is warranted. See NRS 34.160; NRS 34.170; *Round Hill Gen. Improvement Dist. v. Newman*, 97 Nev. 601, 603-04, 637 P.2d 534, 536 (1981) (“Mandamus will not lie to control discretionary action, unless discretion is manifestly abused or is exercised arbitrarily or capriciously.” (internal citation omitted)). Followill challenged the denial of parole in a petition for a writ of mandamus filed in the district court and appealed from the district court’s denial of that petition. See *Followill v. Parole Bd. of Comm’rs*, No. 86099, 2023 WL 2414975 (Nev., March 8, 2023) (Order Dismissing Appeal). As Followill had—and indeed pursued—a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law, she fails to demonstrate that extraordinary relief is warranted. See *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004) (noting that a writ of mandamus is proper only

when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law and explaining that petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that writ relief is warranted). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C. J.  
Stiglich

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Lee

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Bell

cc: Nicole Christine Followill  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Attorney General/Dep't of Public Safety/Carson City