IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MICHELLE STALK AND URBAN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, Petitioners,

vs.

Real Party in Interest.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN
AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND
THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY C.
WILLIAMS, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
MICHAEL MUSHKIN,

No. 54071

FILED

SEP 2 4 2009

THACIAK, LINDEMAN CLERK OF EMPREME COURT BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus, challenging a district court order denying a motion to amend a complaint in a legal malpractice action.

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 an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion. NRS 34.160; Round Hill Gen. Imp. Dist. v. Newman, 97 Nev. 601, 637 P.2d 534 (1981). Mandamus is not available when the petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. NRS 34.170. An appeal is generally an adequate legal remedy precluding writ relief. Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 224, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004). Whether a petition for a writ of mandamus will be considered is purely discretionary with this court. See Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

849, 851 (1991). Petitioners bear the burden of demonstrating that such extraordinary relief is warranted. <u>Pan</u>, 120 Nev. at 228, 88 P.3d at 844.

Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we conclude that petitioners have not met their burden of demonstrating that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted. Accordingly, we order the petition denied. Smith, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851.

It is so ORDERED.

Hardesty, C.J.

Parraguirre

J.

Douglas J.

cc: Hon. Timothy C. Williams, District Judge Kenneth L. Hall Patti, Sgro & Lewis Eighth District Court Clerk