

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHARLES T. "BEAU" WISEMAN AND
CHRISTY WISEMAN,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
WASHOE, AND THE HONORABLE
PETER I. BREEN, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

WASHOE COUNTY; DEAN R. HINITZ,
PH.D.; JOHN MACINTYRE; VISTAR;
RICHARD M. BALDO, PH.D.; BETTY
SPRUILL; AND RICHARD
BLANCHARD,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 40775

FILED

APR 28 2003

JANETTE M. BLOOR
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Richards*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR
WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus challenging the district court's dismissal of seven claims for relief in petitioners' tort lawsuit. We have considered the petition, and we are not satisfied that

this court's intervention by way of extraordinary relief is warranted.¹
Accordingly, we deny the petition.²

It is so ORDERED.

 J.
Shearing

 J.
Leavitt

 J.
Becker

cc: Hon. Peter I. Breen, District Judge
Mirch & Mirch
Kilpatrick Johnston & Adler
Lemons Grundy & Eisenberg
Piscevich & Fenner
Washoe District Court Clerk

¹NRS 34.170 (providing that a writ of mandamus will not issue if petitioners have a plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law); Karow v. Mitchell, 110 Nev. 958, 878 P.2d 978 (1994) (recognizing that an appeal is an adequate legal remedy); NRAP 21(a) (stating that petitioners bear the burden of establishing a right to writ relief); Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d 849 (1991) (stating that the issuance of a writ of mandamus is purely discretionary).

²See NRAP 21(b). Petitioners' request for a change of venue is denied as moot.