

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NATALIE GENNARDO,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE T.  
ARTHUR RITCHIE, JR., DISTRICT  
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

DOUG GENNARDO,  
Real Party in Interest.

No. 83445-COA

FILED

OCT 04 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION  
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION*

This original, emergency petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges district court orders determining child custody and temporarily granting real party in interest permission to relocate to Texas with the parties' children. Real party in interest has filed an answer, as directed, and petitioner has filed a reply.

Having considered the petition, answer, and reply, we conclude that our extraordinary intervention is not warranted at this time. In particular, a writ of mandamus or prohibition may issue only when there exists no adequate and speedy remedy at law, and an appeal is generally an adequate and speedy 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. Here, once the district court enters the divorce decree and/or the final custody order, petitioner may appeal therefrom, if

aggrieved, *see* NRAP 3A(a); NRAP 3A(b)(1) and (7), and petitioner has not demonstrated that the circumstances warrant this court's immediate intervention. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Tao

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Bulla

cc: Hon. T. Arthur Ritchie, Jr., District Judge, Family Court Division  
Fine Carman Price  
Standish Law Group  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>In light of this order, petitioner's request to supplement the record, as provided in footnote 1 in her reply, is denied as moot.