IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FRONT SIGHT ENTERPRISES, LLC, A
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY; FRONT SIGHT
OPERATIONS, INC., A NEVADA
CORPORATION; FRONT SIGHT
MANAGEMENT, INC., A CALIFORNIA
CORPORATION; AND IGNATIUS A.
PIAZZA, II, AN INDIVIDUAL,
Petitioners,

VS.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, THE HONORABLE LEE A. GATES, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents,

and

DALIA ANGELICA VALENCIA; JESUS VALENCIA, V, A MINOR CHILD; VALERIA VALENCIA, A MINOR CHILD; JESUS VALENCIA, III; AND MARIA VALENCIA, Real Parties in Interest.

No. 51592

FILED

JUN 12 2008

CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order affirming and adopting the recommendations of the discovery commissioner.

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

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

08-15012

station, or to control a manifest abuse of discretion.¹ We 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.² Both mandamus and prohibition are extraordinary remedies, and whether a petition for extraordinary relief will be considered is solely within our discretion.³ Having considered this petition, we conclude that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is not warranted. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.4

Maupin

J.

Cherry

Saitta, J.

cc: Hon. Lee A. Gates, District Judge Newman Morris & Dachelet, Ltd. Campbell & Williams Eighth District Court Clerk

¹See NRS 34.160; Round Hill Gen. Imp. Dist. v. Newman, 97 Nev. 601, 603-04, 637 P.2d 534, 536 (1981).

²See NRS 34.320.

³See Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991).

⁴See NRAP 21(b); Smith, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849.