

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CYNTHIA GONZALEZ-SANCHEZ,  
Petitioner,

vs.

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT,  
COUNTY OF CLARK, HONORABLE  
NADIN CUTTER,

Respondents,


and

LARRY SANCHEZ,  
Real Party in Interest.

No. 90380-COA

FILED

APR 04 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING EMERGENCY PETITION*

This original emergency petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition challenges a district court minute order granting a motion in limine and declining to extend certain deadlines. Having considered the petition and appendix, we cannot conclude that petitioner has met her burden of demonstrating that extraordinary writ relief is warranted. *See Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (providing that the petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted); *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (explaining that it is within this court's sole discretion to determine if a writ petition will be considered). In particular, decisions regarding the admission of expert testimony are discretionary and not typically subject to review on a writ petition as the opportunity to appeal generally constitutes an adequate legal remedy. *Williams v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 127 Nev. 518, 524, 262 P.3d 360, 364 (2011). And it does not appear that any of the exceptions to that general

rule apply here. *See id.* at 525, 262 P.3d at 364-65 (discussing exceptions to the general rule). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Bulla

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Nadin Cutter, District Judge, Family Division  
Elisabeth S. Flemming, Chtd.  
Relief Lawyers LLC  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>We also deny petitioner's request for a stay of the district court proceedings as such a request must be made in the district court in the first instance or state why moving first in the district court would be impracticable. NRAP 8(a)(1)-(2).