

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GREGG SULLIVAN, AN INDIVIDUAL,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
ELIZABETH GOFF GONZALEZ,
DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

JANONE, INC., F/K/A APPLIANCE
RECYCLING CENTERS OF AMERICA,
INC., A NEVADA CORPORATION;
GEOTRAQ, INC., A NEVADA
CORPORATION; JOHN ("JON") ISAAC,
AN INDIVIDUAL; ANTONIOS ("TONY")
ISAAC, AN INDIVIDUAL; JUAN
YUNIS, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND ISAAC
CAPITAL GROUP, LLC, A NEVADA
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 80964

FILED

JUN 24 2020

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition challenges a district court order excluding evidence in a tort and breach of contract action.


Having considered the petition and its documentation, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary and discretionary intervention is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (observing that the party seeking writ relief bears the burden of showing such relief is warranted); *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 679, 818 P.2d 849, 851, 853 (1991) (recognizing

that writ relief is an extraordinary remedy and that this court has sole discretion in determining whether to entertain a writ petition). Specifically, whether the petition challenges an order excluding evidence or an order imposing discovery sanctions, petitioner fails to demonstrate that any exceptions to the general rules against considering petitions raising such challenges apply here. *See Las Vegas Sands v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 130 Nev. 578, 581-82, 331 P.3d 876, 878 (2014) (applying the rules for reviewing discovery orders to a writ petition challenging discovery sanctions); *Valley Health Sys., LLC v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 127 Nev. 167, 171, 252 P.3d 676, 678-79 (2011) (outlining exceptions to the general rule against entertaining writ petitions challenging discovery orders); *Williams v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 127 Nev. 518, 524-25, 262 P.3d 360, 364-65 (2011) (outlining exceptions to the general rule against entertaining admissibility-related writ petitions). We therefore

ORDER the petitioner DENIED.

 , J.

Parraguirre

 , J.

Hardesty

 , J.

Cadish

cc: Hon. Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Judge
Cosgrove Law Group, LLC
Sylvester & Polednak, Ltd.
Holland & Hart LLP/Las Vegas
James Clifford Sabalos
Eighth District Court Clerk