

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NATALIE S. GOULD, INDIVIDUALLY;  
AND WOMEN'S CANCER CENTER OF  
NEVADA, INC., A NEVADA  
CORPORATION,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE  
JAMES CROCKETT, DISTRICT  
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

ANNIS LIME; AND RICHARD LIME,  
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 71668

**FILED**

DEC 13 2016

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS*

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying a motion in limine seeking to exclude certain evidence from trial in a medical malpractice action.


Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we conclude that petitioners have failed to meet their burden of demonstrating that extraordinary writ relief is warranted. See NRS 34.160 (providing that 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); NRS 34.170 (explaining that writ relief is generally not available when the petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law); *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) ("Petitioners carry the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted."). In this case,


16-901475

petitioners have an adequate remedy in the form of an appeal from the final judgment in the underlying matter. *See Williams v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 127 Nev. 518, 524-25, 262 P.3d 360, 364-65 (2011) (explaining that the opportunity to appeal generally precludes writ relief to challenge pretrial evidentiary decisions); *Pan*, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841 (holding that an appeal is generally an adequate remedy precluding writ relief). Accordingly, we deny the petition. *See* NRAP 21(b); *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (providing that whether to consider a writ petition is discretionary).

It is so ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Tao

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Silver

cc: Hon. James Crockett, District Judge  
John H. Cotton & Associates, Ltd.  
Benson, Bertoldo, Baker & Carter, Chtd.  
Eighth District Court Clerk