


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SIGAL CHATTAH,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CARSON CITY; AND THE
HONORABLE JAMES E. WILSON,
DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
BARBARA K. CEGAVSKE, IN HER
CAPACITY AS NEVADA SECRETARY
OF STATE; AND JOHN T. KENNEDY,
AN INDIVIDUAL,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 85298

FILED

SEP 12 2022

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER DENYING PETITION


This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order denying an application for a temporary restraining order and motion for preliminary injunction in an action challenging a candidate's qualifications for the Office of Attorney General. Petitioner requests relief by September 15, 2022.


The writs that petitioner seeks generally are not available when the petitioner has a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. NRS 34.170 (mandamus); NRS 34.330 (prohibition); *Walker v. Second Judicial Dist. Court*, 136 Nev. 678, 679-80, 476 P.3d 1194, 1196 (2020) (discussing adequate remedies that preclude writ relief in the context of resolving a petition for a writ of mandamus). Here, petitioner has another remedy at

law. The order she challenges was *immediately* appealable under NRAP 3A(b)(3) because it “refus[es] to grant an injunction.” Thus, the circumstances here are unlike other cases where this court has entertained a writ petition even though another remedy was available. *See, e.g., D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 123 Nev. 468, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736 (2007) (explaining that “[w]hether a future appeal is sufficiently adequate and speedy necessarily turns on the underlying proceedings’ status, the types of issues raised in the writ petition, and whether a future appeal will permit this court to meaningfully review the issues presented” and concluding that “an eventual appeal” many years later would be “neither a speedy nor adequate remedy” when the issue involved pre-litigation notice of construction defects meant to prevent litigation altogether and the case had already been pending in district court for more than two years); *Falcke v. Douglas County*, 116 Nev. 583, 586-87, 3 P.3d 661, 662-63 (2000) (recognizing that petitioner could have sought relief through declaratory relief action but concluding that the case presented urgent and important issues of law that should be addressed via a writ petition to avoid further delay). And petitioner has filed a notice of appeal from the district court’s order, which has been docketed in this court as *Chattah v. Cegavske*, No. 85302. She can request an expedited briefing schedule in that appeal to the extent one is warranted. *See* NRAP 2 (“On the court’s own or a party’s motion, the court may—to expedite its decision or for other good cause—suspend any provision of these Rules in a particular case and order proceedings as the court directs . . .”).

Because petitioner has a speedy and adequate remedy at law,
we
ORDER the petition DENIED.



Parraguirre, C.J.


Hardesty, J.


Stiglich, J.


Cadish, J.


Silver, J.


Pickering, J.


Herndon, J.

cc: Hon. James E. Wilson, District Judge
Joey Gilbert Law
Attorney General/Las Vegas
Gallian Welker & Beckstrom, LC/Las Vegas
Carson City Clerk