

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SALLY LEHRMAN,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
DOUGLAS; AND THE HONORABLE
NATHAN TOD YOUNG, DISTRICT
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

JANE LEHRMAN; AND WENDI LUTZ,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 68190

FILED

JUN 18 2015


TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK


*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT
OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION*

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order denying a motion to enforce a settlement agreement. Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we are not persuaded that petitioner has met her burden of demonstrating that our extraordinary intervention is warranted, as DCR 16 requires an agreement, by consent, to “be entered in the minutes in the form of an order,” *see Grisham v. Grisham*, 128 Nev., Adv. Op. 60, 289 P.3d 230, 233 (2012) (explaining DCR 16’s application and how the rule is satisfied), and the district court’s finding regarding lack of mutual assent to specific terms in the proposed settlement agreement is supported by substantial evidence and is not clearly erroneous. *Id.* at ___, 289 P.3d at 236; *May v. Anderson*, 121 Nev. 668, 672-73, 119 P.3d 1254, 1257 (2005); *see* NRS 34.160; NRS 34.320; *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222,

224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004). Accordingly, we deny the petition.
NRAP 21(b); *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818
P.2d 849, 851 (1991).

It is so ORDERED.


_____, J.
Saitta


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Pickering

cc: Hon. Nathan Tod Young, District Judge
Anderson Keuscher, PLLC
Smith & Harmer
Heritage Law Group, PC
Douglas County Clerk