IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MARY SHEHATA, D.M.D.,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
RONALD J. ISRAEL, DISTRICT
JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
JOSEPH MCQUADE, INDIVIDUALLY,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 62347

JAN 17 2013

CLERK OF SUPPLIE COURT

BY DEPUT CLERK

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.

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., 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. Whether a petition for mandamus or prohibition relief will be considered is purely discretionary with this court. Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). 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). Writ relief is generally available only where there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330; Smith,

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

13-01943

107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851. Moreover, this court has held that the right to appeal is generally an adequate legal remedy precluding writ relief. Pan, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841.

Having considered the petition, we conclude that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is not warranted. <u>Smith</u>, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851; NRAP 21(b)(1). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Gibbons

J.

Douglas

Saitta

cc: Hutchison & Steffen, LLC Palazzo Law Firm Eighth District Court Clerk

