IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FULL SERVICE SYSTEMS
CORPORATION,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
TIERRA DANIELLE JONES, DISTRICT
JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
AMIR MOBASSER,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 74145

FILED

DEC 1 8 2017

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying petitioner's motion for summary judgment in a negligence action.

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. See NRS 34.160; Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Judicial Dist. Court, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). A writ of mandamus will not issue, however, if the petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. See NRS 34.170; Int'l Game Tech., 124 Nev. at 197, 179 P.3d at 558. Further, mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, and it is within the discretion of this court to determine if a petition will be considered. See Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 679, 818 P.2d 849, 851, 853 (1991). Petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEVADA

(O) 1947B ((D)

extraordinary relief is warranted. See Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

Having considered the documents before us, we conclude that petitioner has failed to demonstrate that extraordinary writ relief is warranted. See id. Accordingly, we deny the petition. See NRAP 21(b)(1); Smith, 107 Nev. at 677, 818 P.2d at 851.

It is so ORDERED.

Gilver, C.J.

Tao, J.

Gibbons, J.

cc: Hon. Tierra Danielle Jones, District Judge Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker, LLP/Las Vegas Richard Harris Law Firm Eighth District Court Clerk