## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ERENDIRA ESPERANZA GUZMANIBARGUEN, INDIVIDUALLY;
ERENDIRA MEJIA-GUZMAN,
INDIVIDUALLY; MARIA FERNANDEZ
MEJIA-GUZMAN, INDIVIDUALLY;
AND TAMMY HARLESS, AS SPECIAL
ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE ESTATE
OF OSCAR ANICETO MEJIAESTRADA,
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE DAVID WALL, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents,

and

SUNRISE HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER, LLC; OSCAR CHAVES, RN; ERIC S. DENNIS, M.D.; NANCY BEASLEY, RN; ARLAMAY ROGERS, RN; LAUREN HENDRICKS, RN; MARCELINO A. TACADENA, RN; TINA HAYES, CNA; NURSE STRUASS, RN; TIEN CHANG WANG, M.D.; DR. WADE SEARS; ANTHONY KEILY; JEFFREY JOHNSTON; AND SOUTHWEST EMERGENCY ASSOCIATES, Real Parties in Interest.

No. 55362

APR 0 9 2010

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY LERK

## ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying a motion to adjudicate a demand for costs.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A (O) 19

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. See NRS 34.160; Round Hill Gen. Imp. Dist. v. Newman, 97 Nev. 601, 603-04, 637 P.2d 534, 536 (1981). Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, and whether a petition will be considered is within this court's discretion. See Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991).

Based on our review of the documents before us, we conclude that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is not warranted. Accordingly, we deny the petition. <u>See Smith</u>, 107 Nev. at 679, 818 P.2d at 853; NRAP 21(b)(1).

It is so ORDERED.

Cherry, J.

Saitta, J.

J.

Gibbons

cc: Hon. David Wall, District Judge Christensen Law Offices, LLC Alverson Taylor Mortensen & Sanders Hall, Prangle & Schoonveld, LLC/Las Vegas Eighth District Court Clerk