

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ALI SHAHROKHI,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK  
AND THE HONORABLE ANNA C.

ALBERTSON,  
Respondents,

and

PAO L. JARJABKA AND JIMMY L.  
NGUYEN,  
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 89797

**FILED**

FEB 21 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION*

This is a pro se original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition seeking to compel the district court to vacate an order granting a motion to expunge lis pendens.


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 Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). 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. NRS 34.320; *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991).

Whether a petition for extraordinary writ relief will be entertained rests within this court's sound discretion. *D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 123 Nev. 468, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736-37 (2007).


Petitioner bears the burden to show that extraordinary relief is warranted, and such relief is proper only when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. *See Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004). An appeal is generally an adequate remedy precluding writ relief. *Id.* at 224, 88 P.3d at 841. Even when an appeal is not immediately available because the challenged order is interlocutory in nature, the fact that the order may ultimately be challenged on appeal generally precludes writ relief. *Id.* at 225, 88 P.3d at 841.

Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our intervention is warranted. *Id.* at 224, 88 P.3d at 841. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C. J.  
Herndon

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Parraguirre

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

cc: Hon. Anna C. Albertson, Judge  
Ali Shahrokhi  
Jimmy L. Nguyen  
TCM Law  
Eighth District Court Clerk