

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SUSAN ARSLANIAN; VARTAN ARSLANIAN; DINA KHALIL; CHRISTINE MARDIROSSIAN; SETRAK MARDIROSSIAN; JUDY PHAM; A1A INVESTMENTS, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #72; AL UMA, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #36; DINA ENTERPRISES, LLC, D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #263; DIROSSI INVESTMENTS, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #111 AND PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #113; SETO'S INVESTMENTS, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #37; S.N.S. INVESTMENTS, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #47; SUNBAR INVESTMENTS, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #112; SUSAN'S INVESTMENTS, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #121; TIN'S INVESTMENTS, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #112 AND PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #119; AND VARTAN'S INVESTMENTS, INC., D/B/A PURRFECT AUTO SERVICE #108,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND, THE HONORABLE MARK R. DENTON, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 50675

FILED

JAN 11 2008

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying petitioners' motion to strike real party in interest's demand for a jury trial.

Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, and it is within our discretion to determine if a petition will be considered.¹ Writ relief generally is not available unless the district court manifestly abused its discretion or exercised its discretion arbitrarily or capriciously.² It is petitioners' burden, moreover, to demonstrate that our extraordinary intervention is warranted.³ Under NRAP 21(a), in order to satisfy their burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted, petitioners must ensure that their petition includes "copies of any order or opinion or parts of the record which may be essential to an understanding of the matters set forth in the petition."

Petitioners challenge the district court's order denying their motion to strike real party in interest's demand for a jury trial. Petitioners, however, have not included a copy of the challenged order, copies of any motions, oppositions, or replies related to their motion, or any other supporting documents with their petition. Accordingly, we conclude that petitioners have failed to meet their NRAP 21(a) burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted,⁴ and we


¹See Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991).


²See State of Nevada v. Dist. Ct. (Anzalone), 118 Nev. 140, 147, 42 P.3d 233, 237-38 (2002).


³Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

⁴Id.

ORDER the petition DENIED.⁵


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Douglas

cc: Hon. Mark R. Denton, District Judge
Olson, Cannon, Gormley & Desruisseaux
Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto/Carson City
Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto/Consumer Protection
Bureau/Las Vegas
Eighth District Court Clerk

⁵NRAP 21(b); Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851.