IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CARSON CITY, NEVADA, A
CONSOLIDATED MUNICIPALITY AND
POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE
STATE OF NEVADA,
Petitioner,

vs.
THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR
CARSON CITY, AND THE
HONORABLE MICHAEL R. GRIFFIN,
DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,

and
CONCERNED CITIZENS FOR FUJI
PARK AND FAIRGROUNDS, A
NEVADA CORPORATION, AND ALAN
GLOVER, CARSON CITY
CLERK/RECORDER,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 39550



ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION

This is an original petition for a writ of prohibition challenging a district court order that directed an initiative petition to be placed on the November 2002 ballot. We have considered this petition, and we are not satisfied that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted. Specifically, petitioner may appeal from the district court's order. We conclude that petitioner's right to appeal is a speedy and

¹See NRAP 3A(b)(1) (stating that an appeal may be taken from a final judgment).

adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law, precluding writ relief.² Accordingly, we deny the petition.³

It is so ORDERED.

Maupin, C.J.

Shearing J

Becker, J

cc: Hon. Michael R. Griffin, District Judge Carson City District Attorney Smith & Harmer Carson City Clerk

²See NRS 34.330 (providing that a writ of prohibition may be issued only when there is not a plain, speedy, and adequate legal remedy); see also Pengilly v. Rancho Santa Fe Homeowners, 116 Nev. 646, 647-48 n.1, 5 P.3d 569, 570 n.1 (2000).

We note that if petitioner appeals from the district court's order, petitioner may file a motion to suspend the settlement conference requirements under NRAP 16 and to expedite the briefing schedule.

³See NRAP 21(b); Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991).