

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MESA VIEW REGIONAL HOSPITAL;
MMC OF NEVADA LLC D/B/A MESA
VIEW REGIONAL HOSPITAL; ALENE
DAVIS MARROTT, FNP-C; AND
HOLLY CULLIMORE, RN,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK
AND THE HONORABLE JUDGE
JOSEPH HARDY,

Respondents,

and


PEYTON JENNY FORD,
INDIVIDUALLY; ZANE FORD,
INDIVIDUALLY; AND LEANNE
ATKIN, RN,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 90802

FILED

JUL 10 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus challenging district court orders denying a motion for partial dismissal and a motion to reconsider.

This court has original jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus, and the issuance of such extraordinary relief is solely within this court's discretion. *See Nev. Const. art. 6, § 4; D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 123 Nev. 468, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736-37 (2007). 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. *See Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 841, 844 (2004). An appeal is generally an adequate remedy precluding writ


relief. *Id.* at 224, 88 P.3d at 841. Even when an appeal is not immediately available because the challenged order is interlocutory in nature, the fact that the order may ultimately be challenged on appeal from a final judgment generally precludes writ relief. *Id.* at 225, 88 P.3d at 841.

Having considered the petition, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. 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 orders otherwise fall within any of the narrow grounds that may warrant writ relief. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.



_____, C.J.
Herndon



_____, J.
Parraguirre



_____, J.
Stiglich

cc: Hon. Joseph Hardy, Jr., District Judge
Hall Prangle & Schoonveld, LLC/Las Vegas
Bertoldo Baker Carter Smith & Cullen
Resnick & Louis, P.C./Las Vegas
Quintairos, Prieto, Wood & Boyer, P.A.
Eighth District Court Clerk