IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GREGORY O. GARMONG, Petitioner. vs. THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA. IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE: AND THE HONORABLE PATRICK FLANAGAN, DISTRICT JUDGE. Respondents. and GARY R. SILVERMAN; MARY ANNE DECARIA; MICHAEL V. KATTLEMAN; AND THE LAW FIRM OF SILVERMAN, DECARIA & KATTELMAN, Real Parties in Interest.

No. 62565

FILED

APR 1 2 2013

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERKOP SUPREME COURT
BY
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus that challenges a district court order denying a motion to disqualify a judge.

"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 an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion." International Game Tech. v. Dist. Ct., 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008) (citations omitted); see NRS 34.160. It is within this court's discretion to determine whether a writ petition will be considered. Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). Petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that this court's extraordinary intervention is warranted. Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

A writ of mandamus is the appropriate vehicle for challenging a district court order denying a motion to disqualify a judge. <u>Towbin Dodge, LLC v. Dist. Ct.</u>, 121 Nev. 251, 254-55, 112 P.3d 1063, 1066 (2005). Having reviewed this petition and the supporting documents, we are not persuaded that the district court's order warrants reversal. Accordingly, petitioner has not demonstrated that our intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted, NRAP 21(b)(1); <u>Smith</u>, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851, and we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹

Hardesty

Parraguirre

Cherry, J.

cc: Hon. Patrick Flanagan, District Judge Carl M. Hebert Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg Washoe District Court Clerk

¹We express no opinion regarding the district court's discovery and summary judgment orders. In light of this order, we deny petitioner's March 28, 2013, motion for a temporary stay.