## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

HITCHIN' POST, INC., A NEVADA CORPORATION,

Petitioner.

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE STEPHEN L. HUFFAKER, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

ROBERT O. HARRAH, AN INDIVIDUAL, AND TANYA HARRAH, AN INDIVIDUAL,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 38532

FILED

NOV 14 2001

CLERK DE SUPREMBCOURT
BY
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

## ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND DIRECTING COUNSEL TO SHOW CAUSE

This petition for a writ of mandamus challenges the district court's August 2, 2001 order that denied petitioner's motion to strike the real parties in interest's trial de novo request. On October 3, 2001, we directed the real parties in interest, on behalf of respondents, to file an answer within thirty days against issuance of the requested writ. To date, the real parties in interest have not complied with our October 3, 2001 order. Notwithstanding the lack of an answer, we have reviewed the petition, and we are not satisfied that this court's intervention is warranted. We therefore deny the petition.

Furthermore, counsel for the real parties in interest, David J. Winterton, shall have twenty days from the date of this order within

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>See NRAP 21(b); Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991).

which to show cause why he should not be sanctioned for failing to timely comply with our October 3, 2001 order.

It is so ORDERED.2

Shearing J.
Rose J.

cc: Hon. Stephen L. Huffaker, District Judge Wieczorek & Associates Edwards & Winterton, Chtd. Clark County Clerk

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>We deny as most petitioner's motion for a stay of the district court proceedings pending resolution of the writ petition.