

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAY BLOOM,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK  
AND THE HONORABLE TINA TALIM,  
DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

FTI CONSULTING, LLP,  
Real Party in Interest.

No. 90217

**FILED**

APR 01 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS  
AND/OR PROHIBITION*

This original petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition challenges a district court order denying a motion to set aside judgment under NRCP 60(b).


This court has original jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus and prohibition, 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, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736-37 (2007). 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. *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.

Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. When the finding of contempt is part of a judgment, the contempt issue may be heard on appeal of the


judgment. *See, Vaile v. Vaile*, 133 Nev. 213, 217, 396 P.3d 791, 794-95 (2017). Petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy, *see* NRS 34.170, NRS 34.330, and has filed a notice of appeal in Docket No. 90253.

Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

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

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

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

cc: Hon. Tina Talim, District Judge  
Hutchison & Steffen, LLC/Las Vegas  
Wiley Petersen  
Eighth District Court Clerk