

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MARLENE REDMOND,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
DOUGLAS SMITH, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,


and

DIGNITY HEALTH, D/B/A ST. ROSE
DOMINICAN HOSPITAL-SAN MARTIN
CAMPUS; AND HERMINIA DIOKNO,
INDIVIDUALLY,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 76366

FILED

OCT 04 2018

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This pro se original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges, among other things, a district court order denying petitioner's motion to relate back to conform to the evidence in this professional negligence case. Petitioner points out that the Bureau of Health Care Quality and Compliance found respondent Dignity Health out of compliance.

Having considered this petition and supporting documents, we are not satisfied that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted. *See* NRAP 21(b); *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). In particular, petitioner challenges various interlocutory rulings largely related to discovery and the amendment or clarification of her complaint. Copies of her district court motions, any oppositions, and the district court orders thereon are not included in her appendix of exhibits, however, rendering us unable to

properly review her assertions. *See Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228–29, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). Moreover, we rarely intervene in the district court’s pre-trial management of a case, as doing so is disruptive to the district court proceedings and such cases lack the benefit of a complete record for review. *Archon Corp. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 133 Nev., Adv. Op. 101, 407 P.3d 702, 709 (2017). Here, trial is scheduled to begin in November. We conclude that petitioner has an adequate and speedy legal remedy in the form of an appeal from the final judgment, if aggrieved, precluding writ relief. NRS 34.170; *Pan*, 120 Nev. at 228, 88 P.3d at 844; *see Consol. Generator-Nev., Inc. v. Cummins Engine Co.*, 114 Nev. 1304, 1312, 971 P.2d 1251, 1256 (1998) (recognizing that an interlocutory order may be challenged in the context of an appeal from the final judgment). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹



C.J.

Silver



J.

Tao



J.

Gibbons

cc: Hon. Douglas Smith, District Judge
Marlene Redmond
Alverson Taylor & Sanders
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹In light of this order, petitioner’s motions for stay are denied as moot. Any additional relief requested in petitioner’s documents is denied.