

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FARNAZ NOROZIAN, AS
ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE ESTATE
OF FARAZ NOROZIAN; KENNETH
KIM, M.D.; OBIAGERI THELMA EKEH,
M.D.; NIKKI CUASAY, A.P.N.; POKROY
MEDICAL GROUP OF NEVADA, LTD.
D/B/A PEDIATRIX MEDICAL GROUP
OF NEVADA AND MEDNAX
SERVICES, INC. D/B/A MEDNAX
NATIONAL MEDICAL GROUP,
Petitioners,

vs.

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

Respondents,

and

JAIME ALVAREZ AND ELIZABETH
ALVAREZ, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS
NATURAL PARENTS OF X. A., A
MINOR AND VALLEY HEALTH
SYSTEMS, LLC D/B/A SUMMERLIN
HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER, LLC,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 90211-COA

FILED

APR 17 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus seeking to challenge the district court's denial of a motion for summary judgment.

"A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion." *See Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d


556, 558 (2008); *see also* NRS 34.160. Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, and it is within the discretion of this court to determine if a petition will be considered. *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991). Petitioners bear the burden to show that extraordinary relief is warranted, and such relief is proper only when there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004).


As a general rule, “judicial economy and sound judicial administration militate against the utilization of mandamus petitions to review orders denying motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment.” *State ex rel. Dep’t of Transp. v. Thompson*, 99 Nev. 358, 362, 662 P.2d 1338, 1340 (1983), *as modified by State v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 118 Nev. 140, 147, 42 P.3d 233, 238 (2002). Although this rule is not absolute, *see Int’l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 122 Nev. 132, 142-43, 127 P.3d 1088, 1096 (2006), petitioners have not demonstrated that an appeal from a final judgment would not afford a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy, *see* NRS 34.170, or that the district court’s order otherwise falls within any of the narrow grounds that may warrant writ relief.

Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Bita Yeager, District Judge
Hutchison & Steffen, LLC/Las Vegas
Clark Newberry Law Firm
Hall Prangle & Schoonveld, LLC/Las Vegas
Bighorn Law/Las Vegas
Eighth District Court Clerk