


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PETER JASON HELFRICH,
Petitioner,
vs.
CLARK COUNTY; STATE OF NEVADA
PAROLE AND PROBATION; TAMRAH
JACKSON; TOM LAWSON; AND
OFFICER MERCADO,
Respondents.

No. 87833

FILED

JAN 29 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION


This original pro se petition seeks a writ directing the Chief of Parole and Probation in Clark County to waive parole fees pursuant to NRS 213.1076.

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 discretion to entertain a petition for extraordinary relief even if “important

public interests are involved”); *State v. County of Douglas*, 90 Nev. 272, 276-77, 524 P.2d 1271, 1274 (1974) (noting that “this court prefers that such an application [for writ relief] be addressed to the discretion of the appropriate district court” in the first instance), *abrogated on other grounds by Att’y Gen. v. Gypsum Res.*, 129 Nev. 23, 33-34, 294 P.3d 404, 410-11 (2013); *see also Walker v. Second Judicial Dist. Court*, 136 Nev. 678, 684, 476 P.3d 1194, 1199 (2020) (noting that this court typically will not entertain petitions for extraordinary relief that implicate factual disputes). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹


_____, C.J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Herndon

cc: Peter Jason Helfrich
Attorney General/Carson City
Nye County District Attorney
Nye County Clerk

¹ Given this disposition, we deny the Motion for Leave to Supplement Exhibit 1 in Support of Indigence, filed on January 24, 2024, as moot.