

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROWEN SEIBEL; MOTI PARTNERS,
LLC; MOTI PARTNERS 16, LLC; LLTQ
ENTERPRISES, LLC; LLTQ
ENTERPRISES 16, LLC; TPOV
ENTERPRISES, LLC; TPOV 16
ENTERPRISES, LLC; FERG 16, LLC; R
SQUARED GLOBAL SOLUTIONS, LLC,
DERIVATIVELY ON BEHALF OF DNT
ACQUISITION, LLC; GR BURGR, LLC;
AND CRAIG GREEN,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
TIMOTHY C. WILLIAMS, DISTRICT
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and


DESERT PALACE, INC.; PARIS LAS
VEGAS OPERATING COMPANY, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; AND BOARDWALK
REGENCY CORPORATION,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 83071

FILED

JUN 18 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION

This original petition for a writ of prohibition challenges a district court order granting in part a motion to compel the disclosure of allegedly privileged attorney-client communications and directing petitioner to turn over the communications for an in camera review.


Petitioner has also filed an emergency motion for stay,¹ which real parties in interest have opposed. Petitioner has filed a reply.

Whether to entertain a petition for extraordinary writ relief is discretionary with this court. *Leibowitz v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 119 Nev. 523, 529, 78 P.3d 515, 519 (2003). It is petitioner's burden to demonstrate that extraordinary relief is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we conclude that petitioner has not demonstrated that our extraordinary intervention is warranted at this time. In particular, the district court has not completed its review of the matter, determining merely that real parties in interest have demonstrated that its in camera review is warranted. Only after that review is completed may the district court compel petitioner to disclose the documents to real parties in interest. Thus, without prejudice to petitioner's ability to seek writ relief in the event he is ordered to disclose the subject documents to real parties in interest, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.²


_____, J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Pickering


_____, J.
Herndon

¹Petitioner's motion to file a redacted writ petition and several volumes of the appendix under seal is granted, as the information contained therein was sealed below. SRCR 3(4)(b), 7. The clerk of this court shall file, under seal, the writ petition and volumes 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14A, 14B, 15, and 16, all of which were provisionally received in this court on June 17, 2021.

²In light of this order, petitioner's motion for a stay is denied as moot.

cc: Hon. Timothy C. Williams, District Judge
Bailey Kennedy
Pisanelli Bice, PLLC
Eighth District Court Clerk