## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BIOLIFE PLASMA SERVICES, LP, Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK AND THE HONORABLE CRYSTAL ELLER,

Respondents,

and

ANGELO EROLES,

Real Party in Interest.

No. 90033-COA

FILED

MAR 1 0 2025

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY

DEPUTY CHEK

## ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Biolife Plasma Services, LP, filed a petition for a writ of mandamus challenging a discovery order.

A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion. See NRS 34.160; Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct., 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, and it is within the discretion of this court to determine if a petition will be considered. Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct., 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). Petitioner bears 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. Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004).

Based on our review of the writ petition and the documents before us, we conclude petitioner has not demonstrated that our

COURT OF APPEALS

OF

NEVADA

7O1 1947B

25-10928

extraordinary intervention is warranted. See id. at 228, 88 P.3d at 844. Generally, this court does not intervene in discovery matters absent circumstances not alleged here. See Club Vista Fin. Servs., LLC v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct., 128 Nev. 224, 228, 276 P.3d 246, 249 (2012). Accordingly, we deny the petition. See NRAP 21(b)(1).

It is so ORDERED.

Bulla

C.J.

J.

J.

Gibbons

Westbrook

cc: Hon. Crystal Eller, District Judge Worthe Hanson & Worthe H&P Law, PLLC Eighth District Court Clerk