

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LAURA PURKETT, INDIVIDUALLY  
AND AS PERSONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ESTATE  
OF SANDRA CAMACHO; AND  
ANTHONY CAMACHO,  
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE  
NADIA KRALL, DISTRICT JUDGE,  
Respondents,

and

PHILIP MORRIS USA, INC., A  
FOREIGN CORPORATION; R.J.  
REYNOLDS TOBACCO COMPANY, A  
FOREIGN CORPORATION,  
INDIVIDUALLY, AND AS  
SUCCESSOR-BY-MERGER TO  
LORILLARD TOBACCO COMPANY  
AND AS SUCCESSOR-IN-INTEREST  
TO THE UNITED STATES TOBACCO  
BUSINESS OF BROWN &  
WILLIAMSON TOBACCO  
CORPORATION, WHICH IS THE  
SUCCESSOR-BY-MERGER TO THE  
AMERICAN TOBACCO COMPANY;  
LIGGETT GROUP, LLC., A FOREIGN  
CORPORATION; AND ASM  
NATIONWIDE CORPORATION D/B/A  
SILVERADO SMOKES & CIGARS, A

No. 86501

FILED

MAY 29 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

DOMESTIC CORPORATION,  
Real Parties in Interest.

### ORDER DENYING PETITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges district court orders granting Real Parties in Interest's motions for summary judgment.

Having considered the petition and supporting documentation, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary and discretionary intervention is warranted. *See Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004) (observing that the party seeking writ relief bears the burden of showing such relief is warranted and providing that an appeal is typically an adequate legal remedy precluding writ relief); *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 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, traditional mandamus is not appropriate here because petitioners have a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the form of an appeal from a final judgment. *See Pan*, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841 (“[T]he right to appeal is generally an adequate legal remedy that precludes writ relief.”). We likewise decline to exercise our discretion to entertain the case under advisory mandamus. *See Archon Corp. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 133 Nev. 816, 821, 824, 407 P.3d 702, 707, 709 (2017) (recognizing that “[t]he sound exercise of that discretion requires special care in the advisory mandamus context, to avoid subverting the final judgment rule and inviting, rather than avoiding, undue delay and expense


in dispute resolution” and discussing the risks entailed by advisory mandamus). We therefore


ORDER the petition DENIED.


  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Cadish


  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Stiglich

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Pickering

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Herndon

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Lee

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Parraguirre

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Bell

cc: Claggett & Sykes Law Firm  
Kelley Uustal/Fort Lauderdale  
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP/Kansas City  
Weinberg, Wheeler, Hudgins, Gunn & Dial, LLC/Las Vegas  
Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP/Las Vegas  
Bailey Kennedy  
Kasowitz Benson Torres LLP/Miami  
Fasi & DiBello, P.A./Florida  
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP/Texas  
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP / New York  
Eighth District Court Clerk