

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ACE CAB LLC, A DOMESTIC
LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY; AND
TIBEBU GEBREMICHAEL,
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
JOSEPH HARDY, JR., DISTRICT
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and


ROBERT J. LANG, AN INDIVIDUAL
AND AS PARENT AND GUARDIAN OF;
IVANA LANG, A MINOR; ANTONIO
LANG, A MINOR; REBECCA LANG, AN
INDIVIDUAL; DANIEL LANG, AN
INDIVIDUAL; FRANCISCO LANG, AN
INDIVIDUAL; AND ADMINISTRATOR
FOR THE ESTATE OF LIDIA YUEJUN
LANG,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 80510

FILED

FEB 19 2020

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR
PROHIBITION*

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or, in the alternative, prohibition challenges a district court order granting real parties in interests' partial motion for summary judgment in a tort matter.

This court has original jurisdiction to grant writs of mandamus and prohibition, and the issuance of such extraordinary relief is solely within this court's discretion. *See Nev. Const. art. 6, § 4; D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 123 Nev. 468, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736-37

(2007). As a general rule, “judicial economy and sound judicial administration militate against the utilization of mandamus petitions to review orders [granting] motions for summary judgment.” *State ex rel. Dep’t of Transp. v. Thompson*, 99 Nev. 358, 362, 662 P.2d 1338, 1340 (1983), as modified by *State v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 118 Nev. 140, 147, 42 P.3d 233, 238 (2002); see also *In re Irrevocable Trust Agreement of 1979*, 130 Nev. 597, 601, 331 P.3d 881, 884 (2014) (noting this court generally declines to exercise its discretion to consider petitions challenging orders granting summary judgment). Although the rule is not absolute, see *Int’l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Judicial Dist. Court*, 122 Nev. 132, 142-43, 127 P.3d 1088, 1096 (2006), petitioner has not established that an eventual appeal does not afford an adequate legal remedy. NRS 34.170. Interlocutory review by extraordinary writ is not warranted in this case. For these reasons, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹

Pickering, C.J.
Pickering

Hardesty, J.
Hardesty

Cadish, J.
Cadish

cc: Hon. Joseph Hardy, Jr., District Judge
Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker, LLP/Las Vegas

¹In light of this order, we vacate the order granting petitioners’ motion for submission of video exhibit “D” to petitioners’ petition for a writ of mandamus, entered on February 18, 2020.

Wheeler Trigg & O'Donnell LLP
Shook & Stone, Chtd.
Eighth District Court Clerk