

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANGELIKA SROUJI, AN INDIVIDUAL;
AND MOIST TOWEL SERVICES LTD,
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
MARK R. DENTON, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,

and

A & H INVESTMENTS LLC, A
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY; MOIST TOWEL
PRODUCTS AND SERVICES LLC, A
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY; HAB SIAM, AN
INDIVIDUAL; ALTIMETER, A
CALIFORNIA CORPORATION;
BAHAREH IRANMANESH, A
CALIFORNIA RESIDENT; KEVIN
JUST, A CALIFORNIA RESIDENT;
AND JUST, GURR & ASSOCIATES, A
CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 88440

FILED

APR 16 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS


This emergency petition for a writ of mandamus challenges aspects of the preemptory challenge process in the underlying case.


A writ of mandamus may be available to compel a legally required act or to correct a manifest abuse of discretion. NRS 34.160; *Walker v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 136 Nev. 678, 680, 476 P.3d 1194, 1196

(2020). Whether to issue extraordinary writ relief is solely within this court's discretion, however, *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991), and it is petitioner's burden to demonstrate that such relief is warranted, *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

Having reviewed the petition, errata, and appendices in this matter, we decline to intervene. At this point, the underlying cases have been transferred to another judge based on petitioner's peremptory challenge; thus, the main contention raised in the original petition, that the district court did not transfer the cases within 2 days under SCR 48.1, is moot. Further, while petitioner's errata seeks clarification as to whether the motion to consolidate was filed early under EDCR 2.50(a)(1), whether she filed her peremptory challenge early, whether each party to the third case had the right to file a peremptory challenge, and whether counsel's withdrawal was a contested matter, these questions concern matters within the district court's case management purview, as well as those that the district court has not yet ruled on but are likely to come up in later proceedings on the motions the parties have filed, and are not appropriate for writ review. *See Walker*, 136 Nev. at 681, 476 P.3d at 1197 (explaining that writ relief is available only when the district court has acted and manifestly abused its discretion, not to "correct" any and every lower court decision"). Therefore, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Cadish


_____, J.
Stiglich


_____, J.
Herndon

cc: Hon. Mark R. Denton, District Judge
Angelika Srouji
West Coast Trial Lawyers/Henderson
Snell & Wilmer, LLP/Las Vegas
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP/Denver
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP/Chicago
Lipson Neilson P.C.
Peterson Baker, PLLC
Eighth District Court Clerk