IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CARDNO WRG, INC., A DELAWARE CORPORATION F/K/A WRG DESIGN, INC., Petitioner, vs. THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE; AND THE HONORABLE STEVEN R. KOSACH, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents, and DAVID HALL, Real Party in Interest. No. 59974



12-33978

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 granting a motion to dismiss a third-party complaint seeking indemnity and contribution in a contract and tort action.

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; <u>International Game Tech. v. Dist. Ct.</u>, 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. Where there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330, extraordinary relief may be available. <u>Smith v. District Court</u>, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 679, 818 P.2d 849, 851, 853 (1991). Either writ is an extraordinary remedy, and whether writ

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA relief will be considered is within our sole discretion. Id. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851. It is 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, real party in interest's answer, petitioner's reply, and the supporting documents, we conclude that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is not warranted. Smith, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

J.

Saitta

J. Pickering

J.

Hardesty

cc:

Hon. Steven R. Kosach, District Judge Johns & Durrant, LLP Erickson Thorpe & Swainston, Ltd. Washoe District Court Clerk

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA