

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PRESTIGE MANAGEMENT GROUP,
LLC AND EPIC ASSOCIATION
MANAGEMENT LLC, NEVADA
DOMESTIC NONPROFIT
CORPORATIONS,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF

CLARK, DEPT 10 AND THE
HONORABLE TIERRA DANIELLE
JONES, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and


LILY FLOWER TRUST, BY AND
THROUGH ITS TRUSTEES, TIMOTHY
DION WETZEL AND MIA SHEN
GOLDBERG, INDIVIDUALLY, DOES 1
THROUGH 100, INCLUSIVE, AND ROE
BUSINESS ENTITIES 1-C,
INCLUSIVE,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 90204

FILED

MAR 18 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION


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. Tierra Danielle Jones, District Judge
The Law Office of Michael W. McKelleb, Esq. PLLC
Dobberstein Law Group
Eighth District Court Clerk