

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SEBASTIAN FILUTOWSKI,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE  
JACOB REYNOLDS, DISTRICT COURT  
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
DEPARTMENT AND DETECTIVE  
SHANNON BROWN,  
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 91109

FILED

MAY 07 2026

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus challenging a district court order denying a countermotion for partial summary judgment.

Having considered the petition, we are unconvinced that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. *Walker v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 815, 819, 101 P.3d 787, 790 (2004) (“Writ relief is an extraordinary remedy . . .”). Whether to consider a writ of mandamus is within this court’s discretion, *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991), and petitioner bears the burden to demonstrate entitlement to this extraordinary relief, *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). “We have previously stated that we will not exercise our discretion to consider writ petitions that challenge orders of the district court denying . . . motions for summary judgment,”


26-20774


subject to very few exceptions. *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 113 Nev. 1343, 1344, 950 P.2d 280, 281 (1997). We conclude that this petition presents no reason to deviate from that rule, under either traditional or advisory mandamus. Moreover, petitioner's counter-motion for partial summary judgment only addresses one of his thirteen claims. Therefore, granting petitioner's requested relief would not dispose of the entire controversy. *Archon Corp. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 133 Nev. 816, 824, 407 P.3d 702, 709 (2017) (holding an advisory writ of mandamus to be disfavored where it does not dispose of the entire controversy); *Moore v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 96 Nev. 415, 416-17, 610 P.2d 188, 189 (1980) (holding a traditional writ of mandamus to be disfavored where it does not dispose of the entire controversy). Accordingly, we


ORDER the petition DENIED.

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Pickering

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

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

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Cadish

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

cc: Hon. Jacob A. Reynolds, District Judge  
McDonald Carano LLP/Las Vegas  
McDonald Carano LLP/Reno  
Marquis Aurbach Chtd.  
American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada/Las Vegas  
Clark County Public Defender  
Federal Public Defender/Las Vegas  
Eighth District Court Clerk