

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PETER MICHAEL HAUSER,

No. 38679

Appellant,

vs.

TAHOE TOWNSHIP JUSTICE COURT,

Respondent.

**FILED**

JAN 23 2002

JANETTE M BLOOM  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *J. Richards*  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


This is an appeal from an order of the district court denying appellant's petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition. Appellant challenged the justice court's denial of his petition to seal his criminal record, and the district court subsequently denied his petition for extraordinary relief on October 24, 2001.


We have reviewed the documents on file with this court, and we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying

appellant's request for intervention by way of extraordinary writ.<sup>1</sup>  
Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>2</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Young

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Agosti

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Leavitt

---

<sup>1</sup>NRS 34.160, 34.170, 34.310; see also Ashokan v. State, Dep't of Ins., 109 Nev. 662, 665-66, 856 P.2d 244, 246 (1993) (holding that this court has appellate jurisdiction over a district court's order denying petition for extraordinary writ).

<sup>2</sup>We have received and considered appellant's motion for leave to file a supplemental fast track statement. The State opposed the motion. NRAP 3C(g) provides that counsel may file a supplemental statement if (1) appellate counsel differs from trial counsel, and (2) appellate counsel can assert material issues which should be considered and which were not raised in the fast track statement. We conclude that neither requirement has been met, and accordingly we hereby deny appellant's motion.

cc: Hon. David R. Gamble, District Judge  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Douglas County District Attorney/Minden  
Roeser & Roeser  
Douglas County Clerk