


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

EDWAN SHANDO THURMOND,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE ERIC
JOHNSON, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
MARLIN MORTGAGE CAPITAL, LLC,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 88311

FILED

APR 05 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK


*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR
MANDAMUS*


This pro se original petition for a writ of prohibition or mandamus challenges district court orders denying motions to dismiss.

Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. See NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330; *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004) (writ relief is proper only when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law and the petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that writ relief is warranted). As a general rule, “judicial economy and sound judicial administration militate against the utilization of mandamus petitions to review orders denying motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment.” *State ex rel. Dep’t of Transp. v. Thompson*, 99 Nev. 358, 362, 662 P.2d 1338, 1340 (1983), as modified by *State v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 118 Nev. 140, 147, 42 P.3d 233, 238 (2002). Although this rule is not absolute, see *Int’l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 122 Nev. 132, 142-43, 127 P.3d 1088, 1096 (2006), petitioner has not demonstrated that an appeal

from a final judgment below would not afford a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy, or that the challenged orders otherwise fall within any of the narrow grounds that may warrant writ relief. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Herndon

cc: Hon. Eric Johnson, District Judge
Edwan Shando Thurmond
Malcolm Cisneros\Las Vegas
Eighth District Court Clerk