IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, NEVADA GAMING CONTROL BOARD, Petitioner.

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE NANCY M. SAITTA, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents,

and
DONALD GLINSKI; UNITED COIN
MACHINE COMPANY, A NEVADA
CORPORATION; AND ALLIANCE
GAMING CORPORATION, A NEVADA
CORPORATION,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 43671



AUG 2 7 2004



ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order that denied petitioner's motion for summary judgment.

Generally, this court will not exercise its discretion to consider writ petitions challenging district court orders that deny motions to dismiss or motions for summary judgment, unless pursuant to clear authority under a statute or rule, the district court is obligated to dismiss the action or enter summary judgment, or an important issue of law requires clarification.¹

¹Smith v. District Court, 113 Nev. 1343, 950 P.2d 280 (1997).

We have considered this petition, and we are not satisfied that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted at this time. Accordingly, we deny the petition.²

It is so ORDERED.

Shearing, C.J.

Maupin J.

Douglas, J

cc: Hon. Nancy M. Saitta, District Judge Attorney General Brian Sandoval/Gaming Division/Las Vegas Hale Lane Peek Dennison & Howard/Las Vegas Andrew M. Leavitt Clark County Clerk

²See NRAP 21(b); Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991). We note that it appears that we can review the district court's denial of petitioner's motion for summary judgment on direct appeal from any adverse final judgment. NRAP 3A(b)(1); see Consolidated Generator v. Cummins Engine, 114 Nev. 1304, 971 P.2d 1251 (1998) (stating that interlocutory orders may be heard on appeal from final judgment).