IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MEGHAN MCLYNN,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK;
AND THE HONORABLE RONALD J.
ISRAEL, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT
CORPORATION,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 74749

FILED

FEB 15 2018

CLERK OF SUPPLEME COURT

CHIEF DEPLAY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order granting without prejudice a motion to dismiss petitioner's tort complaint as to claims against Caesars Entertainment Corporation. Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we are not persuaded that petitioner has demonstrated that our extraordinary discretionary intervention is warranted. NRS 34.160; Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004); Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d. 849, 851 (1991); see Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 113 Nev. 1343, 1344, 950 P.2d 280, 281 (1997) (observing that this court generally will not consider writ petitions challenging orders resolving motions to dismiss). Among other reasons, we are not persuaded that an appeal from a final judgment is an

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A (O) 19

inadequate remedy. 1 See Pan, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Pickering

Gibbons

Hardesty J

cc: Hon. Ronald J. Israel, District Judge Nersesian & Sankiewicz Fennemore Craig, P.C./Las Vegas Fennemore Craig, P.C./Phoenix Eighth District Court Clerk

It does not appear that petitioner requested the district court to certify as final the order dismissing her complaint against Caesars Entertainment. Although the decision to grant NRCP 54(b) certification is discretionary with the district court, a properly certified order presents an aggrieved party with an additional adequate remedy at law in the form of an immediate appeal.