IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SPANISH HEIGHTS ACQUISITION
COMPANY, LLC; AND SJC VENTURES
HOLDING COMPANY, LLC d/b/a SJC
VENTURES, LLC,
Petitioners,
vs.
THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH
GONZALEZ, DISTRICT JUDGE; AND
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK,
Respondents,
and
CBC PARTNERS I, LLC; 5148 SPANISH

HEIGHTS, LLC; KENNETH ANTOS; AND SHEILA NEUMANN-ANTOS,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 83526

FILED

SEP 3 0 2021

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order appointing a receiver and the court's refusal to grant injunction relief.

An appeal is generally an adequate legal remedy precluding writ relief. Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004); see NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330. Since an order appointing a receiver is appealable under NRAP 3A(b)(4) and an order denying an injunction is appealable under NRAP 3A(b)(3), petitioners have an adequate legal remedy in the form of an appeal from the district court's orders. See NRAP 4(a)(1) (stating that the notice of appeal must be filed

within 30 days from the date when written notice of entry of the order appealed from is served). Indeed, it appears that petitioners have appealed from the challenged orders, see Spanish Heights Acquisition Co., LLC v. CBC Partners I, LLC, Docket Nos. 82868 & 83407, and petitioners have not argued or demonstrated that our extraordinary intervention is nevertheless warranted to review these orders. Thus, we decline to consider this petition for extraordinary writ relief, NRAP 21(b); Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991), and we

ORDER the petition DENIED.1

Hardesty

Parraguirre

J.

Stiglich, J

cc: Hon. Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Judge Hon. Joanna Kishner, District Judge Maier Gutierrez & Associates Mushkin & Coppedge Eighth District Court Clerk



In light of this order, petitioners' emergency motion for stay, as well as real parties in interest's motion to extend the deadline to respond to the stay motion past the requested relief date, are denied as moot.