

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KIDS & HORSES, A DOMESTIC NON-PROFIT CORPORATION; AND VINCE PIROZZI,
Petitioners,

vs.

THE NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF DOUGLAS; AND THE HONORABLE THOMAS W. GREGORY, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

KAREN PAVLAKIS,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 82453

FILED

JUL 22 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *E. A. Brown*
DEPUTY CLERK


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

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order denying a motion for summary judgment in a tort action.¹ Having considered the petition, answer, reply, and supporting documentation, we are not persuaded that petitioners made the required showing to invoke mandamus or prohibition relief. *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004) (explaining that a petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted and that such relief will generally issue only when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law). As a general rule, subject to very few exceptions, we have declined to exercise


¹Pursuant to NRAP 34(f)(1), we have determined that oral argument is not warranted in this matter.

our discretion with respect to writ petitions that challenge district court orders that deny summary judgment motions. *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 113 Nev. 1343, 1344-45, 950 P.2d 280, 281 (1997). We decline to deviate from that rule here, particularly because the issue presented can be raised on appeal from a final judgment. NRS 34.170; *Pan*, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841 (explaining that an appeal is an adequate and speedy remedy). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Pickering


_____, J.
Herndon

cc: Hon. Thomas W. Gregory, District Judge
Bradley Paul Elley
Kilpatrick Bullentini
Douglas County Clerk