

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LIBRA WELLNESS CENTER, LLC, A
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY; AND GLOBAL BIO LABS,
LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY,

Petitioners,

vs.

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

Respondents,


and,

INTERTEX LV, LLC, A NEVADA
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 86251

FILED

AUG 18 2023

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 granting partial summary judgment in a contract action.


Having considered the petition, answer, reply, and supporting documentation, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary and discretionary intervention is warranted. *See Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (observing that the party seeking writ relief bears the burden of showing such relief is warranted); *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 679, 818 P.2d 849, 851, 853 (1991) (recognizing that writ relief is an extraordinary remedy and that this court has sole discretion in determining

whether to entertain a writ petition). In this, we are not persuaded that judicial economy would be furthered by considering the writ petition's merits because our resolution of the petition would not resolve the entire district court matter. *See Moore v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 96 Nev. 415, 416-17, 610 P.2d 188, 189 (1980) (determining that writ relief is not an appropriate remedy when resolution of the writ petition would not dispose of the entire controversy). Additionally, we are not persuaded that an appeal from a final judgment fails to provide petitioners with an adequate legal remedy. *See Pan*, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841 (recognizing that an appeal from a final judgment is generally an adequate remedy precluding writ relief); *cf. Hansen v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 116 Nev. 650, 658, 6 P.3d 982, 986-87 (2000) (recognizing, albeit in the context of a request for a stay, that the prospect of incurring litigation expenses does not rise to the level of warranting this court's intervention). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Bell

cc: Hon. Veronica Barisich, District Judge
Jennings & Fulton, Ltd.
The Wright Law Group, P.C.
Eighth District Court Clerk