

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CRYSTAL MARIE SASHINGER,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
WASHOE; AND THE HONORABLE
SCOTT N. FREEMAN, DISTRICT
JUDGE,
Respondents,
and,
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 86023

FILED

FEB 24 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS
AND/OR PROHIBITION*

This is a pro se original petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition challenging a district court's oral rulings on various pretrial matters in a criminal proceeding.

This court has original jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus and prohibition, and the issuance of such extraordinary relief is solely within this court's discretion. *See Nev. Const. art. 6, § 4; D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 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 Judicial Dist. Court*, 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 from a final judgment generally precludes writ relief. *Id.* at 225, 88 P.3d at 841.

Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. To begin, although petitioner has provided transcripts of hearings during which the district court made oral rulings with which she disagrees, she has not supplied copies of written district court orders memorializing such rulings. *See Rust v. Clark Cnty. Sch. Dist.*, 103 Nev. 686, 689, 747 P.2d 1380, 1382 (1987) (explaining that written orders signed and filed by the district court are essential to this court's review); *see also* NRAP 21(a)(4) (stating that it is the petitioner's obligation to provide an appendix that includes all records that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition). In addition, petitioner has not demonstrated that a direct appeal from a judgment of conviction would not be a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹


_____, C.J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Herndon

¹To the extent petitioner has counsel below, she must proceed by and through her counsel.

cc: Hon. Scott N. Freeman, District Judge
Crystal Marie Sashinger
Attorney General/Carson City
Washoe County District Attorney
Washoe District Court Clerk