IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JOHN R. MCMILLAN, INDIVIDUALLY; AND FLANGAS MCMILLAN LAW GROUP, INC., Petitioners,

VS.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE VALORIE VEGA, Respondents,

and

RITA A. QUAM FAMILY TRUST THROUGH ITS TRUSTEE RITA A. QUAM; AND TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT SERVICES CORPORATION,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 56709

FILED

NOV 1 0 2010

CLERKOF SUPREME COURT
BUDGEPUTY 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 dismiss a tort action.

This court will generally not intervene to consider writ petitions challenging district court orders denying motions to dismiss, unless "pursuant to clear authority . . . the district court is obligated to dismiss an action" or there is an important issue of law requiring clarification. Smith v. District Court, 113 Nev. 1343, 1344-45, 950 P.2d 280, 281 (1997). Here, in light of the complex factual background and the resulting factual disputes, we are not persuaded that the district court had a clear legal duty to dismiss the amended complaint at the pleading stage. Round Hill Gen. Imp. Dist. v. Newman, 97 Nev. 601, 637 P.2d 534 (1981). Moreover, our review of the documentation included with the writ petition

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

10-2949-1

indicates that several claims would remain pending even if this court were to grant in its entirety the relief that petitioners seek. This court has previously acknowledged that writ relief is not warranted when resolution will not dispose of the entire controversy. See Moore v. District Court, 96 Nev. 415, 416-17, 610 P.2d 188, 189 (1980). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Douglas

Hon. Valorie Vega, District Judge cc: Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP/Las Vegas Joseph Y. Hong Jennings, Strouss & Salmon, PLC Eighth District Court Clerk