

**Electronically Filed
Supreme Court
SCPW-18-0000568
15-AUG-2018
09:02 AM**

SCPW-18-0000568

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAI‘I

THADDAEUSS THOMPSON, Petitioner,

vs.

ACO SARKISSIAN ET AL., Respondents.

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING
(CIVIL NO. 18-1-0592-04)

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

(By: Recktenwald, C.J., Nakayama, McKenna, Pollack, and Wilson, JJ.)

Upon consideration of petitioner Thaddaeuss Thompson’s petition for writ of mandamus, filed on July 17, 2018, the documents attached thereto and submitted in support thereof, and the record, it appears that petitioner fails to demonstrate that he is entitled to an extraordinary writ or that he lacks alternative means to seek relief. Petitioner, therefore, is not entitled to the requested writ of mandamus. See Kema v. Gaddis, 91 Hawai‘i 200, 204, 982 P.2d 334, 338 (1999) (a writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy that will not issue unless the petitioner demonstrates a clear and indisputable right to relief

and a lack of alternative means to redress adequately the alleged wrong or obtain the requested action); Honolulu Advertiser, Inc. v. Takao, 59 Haw. 237, 241, 580 P.2d 58, 62 (1978) (a writ of mandamus is not intended to supersede the legal discretionary authority of the trial courts, cure a mere legal error, or serve as a legal remedy in lieu of normal appellate procedure; rather, a writ of mandamus is meant to restrain a judge of an inferior court from acting beyond or in excess of his or her jurisdiction). Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the clerk of the appellate court shall process the petition for writ of mandamus without payment of the filing fee.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for writ of mandamus is denied.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, August 15, 2018.

/s/ Mark E. Recktenwald

/s/ Paula A. Nakayama

/s/ Sabrina S. McKenna

/s/ Richard W. Pollack

/s/ Michael D. Wilson

