

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JESUS AREVALO,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK  
AND THE HONORABLE CHARLES J.  
HOSKIN,

Respondents,

and

CATHERINE DELAO,

Real Party in Interest.

No. 90266-COA

**FILED**

**JUN 05 2025**

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

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


Jesus Arevalo petitions this court for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition challenging a district court order denying his motion to disqualify the presiding judge and seeking to compel the district court to comply with this court's January 17, 2024, writ of mandamus in Docket No. 86607-COA.


A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion. NRS 34.160; *Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). This court may issue a writ of prohibition to arrest the proceedings of a district court exercising its judicial functions when such proceedings are in excess of the district court's jurisdiction. NRS 34.320; *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). Mandamus and probation are extraordinary remedies, and it is within the discretion of this court to determine if a petition will be considered. *Smith*,


107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.3d at 851. 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. *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004).

Based on our review of the petition and other documents before us, we conclude that the petitioner has not demonstrated that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. *Id.* at 228, 88 P.3d at 844. Accordingly, we deny the petition. NRAP 21(b)(1).

It is so ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Bulla

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Charles J. Hoskin, District Judge, Family Division  
Jesus Luis Arevalo  
Willick Law Group  
Eighth District Court Clerk