## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MARILAN SHIH-HSIEH,
Appellant,
vs.
MGM GRAND HOTEL, INC., D/B/A
MGM GRAND HOTEL CASINO AND
THEME PARK, A NEVADA
CORPORATION,
Respondent.

No. 40125 FILED SEP 2 3 2005 JANETTE M BLOOM CLERK OF URBEME COUNT BY CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

## **ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE**

This is a proper person appeal from a district court order dismissing appellant's complaint as a sanction for her failure to comply with discovery. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Joseph S. Pavlikowski, Judge.

A district court's decision to dismiss a complaint as a sanction for discovery abuses is reviewed for abuse of discretion.<sup>1</sup> But when the sanction imposed is dismissal with prejudice, a heightened standard of review applies.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, we will uphold a dismissal with prejudice when "the normal adversary process has been halted due to an unresponsive party."<sup>3</sup>

Here, appellant persistently refused to comply with respondent's requests for information concerning a witness to the incident

<sup>1</sup>Hamlett v. Reynolds, 114 Nev. 863, 865, 963 P.2d 457, 458 (1998).

<sup>2</sup><u>Id.</u> (citing <u>Young v. Johnny Ribeiro Building</u>, 106 Nev. 88, 787 P.2d 777 (1990)).

<sup>3</sup><u>Id.</u> (quoting <u>Skeen v. Valley Bank of Nevada</u>, 89 Nev. 301, 303, 511 P.2d 1053, 1054 (1973)).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

05-18929

that allegedly injured appellant. The information was especially relevant to appellant's claims because it was not clear where the incident took place—on respondent's property or on adjacent property. We thus conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing appellant's complaint with prejudice, and so we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>4</sup>

(aup J. Maupi

J.

Gibbons

J. Hardestv

cc: Hon. Joseph S. Pavlikowski, Senior Judge Marilan Shih-Hsieh Wolfenzon Law Group Clark County Clerk

<sup>4</sup>Although appellant was not granted leave to file papers in proper person, <u>see</u> NRAP 46(b), we have considered the proper person documents received from her, and we deny any relief requested as moot in light of this order.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A