IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TING WANG; AND CHUNG WANG, Petitioners, vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE NANCY L. ALLF, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents, and SHAFIK HIRJI; USF REDDAWAY, INC.; JOHN A. PAVLICH; AND DELTA MECHANICAL, INC.,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 63495

FILED

JUL 2 4 2013

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying a motion to dismiss in a 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; Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Judicial Dist. Court, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). Whether a petition for mandamus relief will be considered is purely discretionary with this court. Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). It is petitioners' burden to demonstrate that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). Writ relief is generally available only when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330; Smith, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851. Moreover, this court has held

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

13-21776

that the right to appeal is typically 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. *Smith*, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851; NRAP 21(b)(1). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Cherry

J.

Hon. Nancy L. Allf, District Judge Law Offices of David M. Jones/Las Vegas Law Offices of Kenneth E. Goates Eglet Wall Christiansen Stephenson & Dickinson Eighth District Court Clerk

cc: