

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KATHERINE KEELEY, M.D., D.D.S.,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE  
JACKIE GLASS, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

BEVERLY SHARON HOLLIS AND  
PAUL HOLLIS,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 45626

**FILED**

FEB 17 2006

JANETTE M. BLOOM  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *J. Richard*  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying petitioner's motion to dismiss. Petitioner maintains that the real parties in interest, the plaintiffs in the underlying case, filed their lawsuit after the applicable statute of limitations had expired. She requests that we direct the district court to vacate the order denying her motion to dismiss based on the alleged running of the statute of limitations and enter an order granting the motion. At this court's direction, the real parties in interest have filed an answer, arguing, among other things, that their complaint was filed within the applicable statute of limitations period.

A petition for a writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, and whether a petition will be entertained is entirely within the discretion

of this court.<sup>1</sup> We have considered this petition and the answer filed by the real parties in interest and we are not satisfied that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, we deny the petition.<sup>3</sup>

It is so ORDERED.<sup>4</sup>

Douglas, J.  
Douglas

Becker, J.  
Becker

Parraguirre, J.  
Parraguirre

cc: Honorable Jackie Glass, District Judge  
Alverson Taylor Mortensen & Sanders  
Mainor Eglet Cottle, LLP  
Clark County Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991).

<sup>2</sup>Id.

<sup>3</sup>Id.

<sup>4</sup>We conclude that neither the petitioner nor the real parties in interest have demonstrated that an award of attorney fees and costs is warranted, thus we deny their requests for fees and costs.