IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANGELA DECHAMBEAU AND JEAN-PAUL DECHAMBEAU, BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND AS SPECIAL ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ESTATE OF NEIL DECHAMBEAU. Petitioners.

VS.

THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA. IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE: AND THE HONORABLE PATRICK FLANAGAN, DISTRICT JUDGE.

Respondents.

and

STEPHEN C. BALKENBUSH, ESQ.; AND THORNDAL ARMSTRONG DELK BALKENBUSH & EISINGER, A NEVADA PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION.

Real Parties in Interest.

No. 72004

FILED

JAN 05 2017

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus challenging a district court order denying a motion to strike an expert witness.

Having considered the petition and supporting documents, we conclude that petitioners have failed to meet their burden of demonstrating that extraordinary writ relief is warranted. See NRS 34.160 (providing that 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); NRS 34.170 (explaining that writ relief is generally not available when the petitioner has a plain, speedy, and

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEVADA

adequate remedy at law); Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) ("Petitioners carry the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted."). In this case, petitioners have an adequate remedy in the form of an appeal from the final judgment in the underlying matter. See Pan, 120 Nev. at 224, 88 P.3d at 841 (holding that an appeal is generally an adequate remedy precluding writ relief). Accordingly, we deny the petition. See NRAP 21(b); Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (providing that whether to consider a writ petition is discretionary).

It is so ORDERED.¹

Silver

Tao

Gibbons

C.e

cc: Hon. Patrick Flanagan, District Judge Kozak Lusiani Law Pollara Law Group Mandelbaum, Ellerton & Associates Washoe District Court Clerk

¹In light of this order, we deny as most petitioners' request, contained in the writ petition, for a stay of the underlying proceedings.