

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHARLES GARRISON,
Appellant/
Cross-Respondent,

vs.

MGM GRAND HOTEL,
Respondent/
Cross-Appellant.

MGM GRAND HOTEL, INC.,
Appellant,

vs.

CHARLES GARRISON,
Respondent.

No. 39792

FILED

MAR 13 2003

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY *J. Richard*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

No. 40663

ORDER DISMISSING APPEALS AND CROSS-APPEAL

Pursuant to the settlement conference, the stipulation of the parties and cause appearing, these appeals and cross-appeal are dismissed. The parties shall bear their own costs and attorney fees. NRAP 42(b).

It is so ORDERED.¹

CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
JANETTE M. BLOOM

BY: *B. Horstmannshoff*

cc: Hon. Valorie Vega, District Judge
Lester H. Berkson, Settlement Judge
Charles Garrison
Gayle F. Nathan
Schreck Brignone Godfrey/Las Vegas
Clark County Clerk

¹ In light of this order, attorney Gayle Nathan's September 30, 2002, motion to withdraw as attorney of record in Docket No. 39792 is denied as moot.

SUPREME COURT
OF
NEVADA

CLERK'S ORDER

(O)-1947 

03-04234

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

STEVEN SAMUEL BRAUNSTEIN,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE
DONALD M. MOSLEY, DISTRICT
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 40667

JAN 16 2003

JAN 16 2003

JENNIFER BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
J. Richards
CHIEF CLERK

STEVEN SAMUEL BRAUNSTEIN,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE
DONALD M. MOSLEY, DISTRICT
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 40668


ORDER DENYING PETITIONS


These are proper person petitions for writs of mandamus.¹ Petitioner complains that contrary to this court's prior order of September 9, 2002, the district court did not transfer his habeas corpus petitions to a


¹We elect to consolidate these petitions for disposition.

different department and conducted further ex-parte proceedings on the petitions.² We have considered the petitions on file herein, and we are not satisfied that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted at this time.³ The documents attached to these petitions indicate that the proceedings below conducted on November 26, 2002, were unrelated because the habeas corpus petitions considered on November 26, 2002, were filed subsequent to this court's order of September 9, 2002. We are confident that the district court will comply with the terms of this court's order of September 9, 2002. Further, this court may review any alleged irregularities in the proceedings conducted on November 26, 2002, in the appeals from the denial of petitioner's September 23, 2002 habeas corpus petitions currently pending in this court in Docket Nos. 40667, and 40678. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petitions DENIED.⁴


_____, J.
Rose


_____, J.
Maupin


_____, J.
Gibbons

²Braunstein v. State, Docket No. 37685, 37761 (Order of Affirmance in Part and Reversal and Remand in Part, September 9, 2002).

³See NRS 34.160; NRS 34.170.

⁴We have considered all proper person documents filed or received in these matters, and we conclude that the relief requested is not warranted.

cc: Hon. Donald M. Mosley, District Judge
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney
Steven Samuel Braunstein
Clark County Clerk