IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PHILIP JOHN FORBES,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
DAVID H. HARRIS,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 68141

FILED

JUL 2 2 2015

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original writ petition challenges a district court order denying a motion to dismiss for failure to timely serve process and granting a motion to enlarge the time in which to serve process.

Having considered petitioner's arguments, we are not persuaded that writ relief is warranted. NRS 34.160; NRS 34.320; Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Judicial Dist. Court, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008); Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). The record supports the district court's determination that the factors set forth in Saavedra-Sandoval v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 126 Nev. 592, 597, 245 P.3d 1198, 1201 (2010), and Scrimer v. Eighth Judicial District Court, 116 Nev. 507, 516, 998 P.2d 1190, 1195-96 (2000), weighed in favor of granting the untimely motion for an extension of the service deadline and denying petitioner's countermotion to dismiss. Therefore, the district court neither exceeded its jurisdiction nor arbitrarily or capriciously exercised its discretion in

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA rendering its decision. *Int'l Game Tech.*, 124 Nev. at 197, 179 P.3d at 558; see Saavedra-Sandoval, 126 Nev. at 595-96, 245 P.3d at 1200-01 (explaining that the good-cause determinations under NRCP 4(i) are within the district court's discretion). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Saitta

Gibbons

Pickering

cc: Hon. Stefany Miley, District Judge Thorndal Armstrong Delk Balkenbush & Eisinger/Las Vegas Richard Harris Law Firm Eighth District Court Clerk