## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MT. HAWLEY INSURANCE No. 53422 COMPANY, Petitioner, vs. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT FILED COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA. IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE PR 0 9 7009 SUSAN JOHNSON, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents, and ITTY AFERI JAYNES CORPORATION. **Real Party in Interest.** 

## ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order granting a motion for partial summary judgment in an insurance matter.

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 station, or to control a manifest abuse of discretion. <u>See</u> NRS 34.160; <u>Round Hill Gen. Imp. Dist. v. Newman</u>, 97 Nev. 601, 603-04, 637 P.2d 534, 536 (1981). Mandamus will not issue when the petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. NRS 34.170. A writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, and whether a petition for extraordinary relief will be considered is solely within our discretion. <u>See Smith v. District</u> <u>Court</u>, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). It is petitioner's burden to demonstrate that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. <u>Pan v. Dist. Ct.</u>, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA Having reviewed the petition, we conclude that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is not warranted, and we order the petition denied. <u>See</u> Smith, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851; NRAP 21(b); <u>see also Fritz Hansen A/S v. Dist. Ct.</u>, 116 Nev. 650, 658, 6 P.3d 982, 986-87 (2000) (stating that trial and litigation expenses, while potentially substantial, do not constitute irreparable or serious harm).

It is so ORDERED.

J. Cherry J. Saitta J. Gibbons

cc:

Hon. Susan Johnson, District Judge Lemons Grundy & Eisenberg Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP Eighth District Court Clerk

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA