

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LEEDS & YORK LLC, A DOMESTIC
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
NADIA KRALL, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and


MICHAEL KAPLAN, M.D.,

Real Party in Interest.

No. 83898

FILED

JUN 17 2022

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION


This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order granting leave to amend a complaint. Having considered the petition, answer, and reply, we conclude that our extraordinary and discretionary intervention is not warranted.¹ See NRS 34.160; NRS 34.170; *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004); *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 679, 818 P.2d 849, 851, 853 (1991). In particular, interlocutory writ relief is generally not available because the district

¹Our review is constrained by petitioner's failure to provide the second amended complaint, and we rely on real party in interest's appendix as necessary. See NRAP 21(a)(4); NRAP 30(b)(2)(A); *Carson Ready Mix, Inc. v. First Nat. Bank of Nev.*, 97 Nev. 474, 476, 635 P.2d 276, 277 (1981) ("It is the responsibility of appellant to make an adequate appellate record."); cf. *Thomas v. State*, 120 Nev. 37, 43, 83 P.3d 818, 822 (2004) (noting that it was improper for counsel to fail to "adequately cite to the record in his briefs or provide this court with an adequate record," and nevertheless resolving the appeal on its merits where the State provided the necessary parts of the record in its appendix).

court's order may be challenged on appeal from final judgment, providing an adequate legal remedy. *See Pan*, 120 Nev. at 224-25, 88 P.3d at 841. Further, additional district court proceedings may provide factual development that may prove useful in resolving the issues presented in the petition.

Insofar as petitioner argues that the petition presents an issue of first impression that this court should resolve—namely “whether a district court can disturb a prior judge’s ruling without justification or rationale”—petitioner is mistaken, as it has not shown that the district court acted in this manner here. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.²


Parraguirre


Pickering


Gibbons Sr.J.

cc: Hon. Nadia Krall, District Judge
Kravitz Schnitzer Johnson Watson & Zeppenfeld, Chtd.
Bowen Law Offices
Eighth District Court Clerk

²The Honorable Mark Gibbons, Senior Justice, participated in the decision of this matter under a general order of assignment.