IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

COLLEGE PARK REHABILITATION CENTER. Petitioner. VS. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA. IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK: AND THE HONORABLE JESSIE ELIZABETH WALSH. DISTRICT JUDGE. Respondents, and TINA MONREAL, AS SPECIAL ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ESTATE OF CUC TRINH AND INDIVIDUALLY: NGHIA LABRADOR, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS HEIR; TRI LE, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS HEIR: AND KIET TRINH, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS HEIR, Real Parties in Interest.

No. 58809

DEC 0 9 2011



ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus, or alternatively, prohibition, challenges a district court order denying a motion to dismiss in a medical malpractice action. As directed, real parties in interest have filed an answer.

Writ relief is generally available when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330. A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion. NRS 34.160; International Game Tech. v. Dist. Ct.,

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

11-37683

124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). A writ of prohibition may be warranted when the district court exceeds its jurisdiction. NRS 34.320. Either writ is an extraordinary remedy, and whether such a writ will be considered is within our sole discretion. Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). It is the petitioner's burden to demonstrate that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

Having considered the petition, we conclude that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is not warranted. <u>Id.</u> Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.1

Pickering J

Rose, Sr

Shearing , Sr

cc: Hon. Jessie Elizabeth Walsh, District Judge Marquis Aurbach Coffing Rourke Law Firm Bernstein & Poisson Eighth District Court Clerk

¹The Honorable Robert Rose and Honorable Miriam Shearing, Senior Justices, participated in the decision of this matter under general orders of assignment.