

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PETER JASON HELFRICH,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA; NDOC;
NEVADA BOARD OF PAROLE
COMMISSIONERS; NEVADA
DIVISION OF PAROLE AND
PROBATION; OFFICER MERCADO;
WESTCARE NEVADA, INC.; AND
AARON D. FORD,
Respondents.

No. 87328

FILED

OCT 05 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This pro se original petition for a writ of mandamus appears to challenge the conditions of petitioner's parole.

Having reviewed the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary and discretionary intervention is warranted. See NRS 34.170; *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004) (writ relief is proper only when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law and the petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that writ relief is warranted). Even assuming the relief sought here could be properly obtained through a petition for a writ of mandamus, any application for such relief should be directed to and resolved by the district court in the first instance so that the factual and legal issues can be fully developed, providing an adequate appellate record to review. See *Round Hill Gen. Improvement Dist. v. Newman*, 97 Nev. 601, 604, 637 P.2d 534, 536 (1981) (recognizing that an appellate court is not the appropriate forum to resolve questions of fact and noting that when there are factual issues presented, appellate courts will not exercise their

