

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ABSOLUTE DENTAL AND DR.
PATRICIA PRADA,
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK
AND THE HONORABLE JOE HARDY,
JR., DISTRICT COURT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

ANN BLOCK,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 90130

FILED

MAR 07 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY: 
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS


This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying a motion to dismiss.


This court has original jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus, and the issuance of such extraordinary relief is solely within this court's discretion. *See Nev. Const. art. 6, § 4; D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 123 Nev. 468, 475, 168 P.3d 731, 737 (2007). Petitioners bear the burden to show that extraordinary relief is warranted, and such relief is proper only when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. *See Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004). An appeal is generally an adequate remedy precluding writ relief. *Id.* at 224, 88 P.3d at 841. Even when an appeal is not immediately available because the challenged order is interlocutory in nature, the fact that the order may ultimately be challenged on appeal from a final judgment generally precludes writ relief. *Id.* at 225, 88 P.3d at 841.

Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. As a general rule, "judicial economy and sound judicial administration militate against the utilization of mandamus petitions to review orders denying motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment." *State ex rel. Dep't of Transp. v. Thompson*, 99 Nev. 358, 362, 662 P.2d 1338, 1340 (1983), as modified by *State v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 118 Nev. 140, 147, 42 P.3d 233, 238 (2002). Although this rule is not absolute, see *Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 122 Nev. 132, 142-43, 127 P.3d 1088, 1096 (2006), petitioners have not demonstrated that an appeal from a final judgment would not afford a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy, see NRS 34.170, or that the district court's order otherwise falls within any of the narrow grounds that may warrant writ relief. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Herndon


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Stiglich

cc: Hon. Joseph Hardy, Jr., District Judge
Garin Law Group
Ann Block
Eighth District Court Clerk