

Ngirmang v. Ngiraklsong, 3 ROP Intrm. 332 (1993)
GABRIELLA NGIRMANG,
Petitioner,

v.

THE HONORABLE ARTHUR NGIRAKLSONG,
CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE PALAU SUPREME COURT
Respondent.

SPECIAL PROCEEDING NO. 5-93

Supreme Court, Appellate Division
Republic of Palau

Order denying petition for writ of mandamus
Decided: October 21, 1993

Counsel for Petitioner: Martin Wolff

BEFORE: JEFFREY L. BEATTIE, Associate Justice; LARRY W. MILLER, Associate Justice;
and JANET H. WEEKS, Part-Time Associate Justice.

PER CURIAM:

On September 13, 1993, Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus seeking to require the Respondent judge to hold a hearing and rule on nine pending motions. Our observations in *BMC Corporation v. Nigraklsong*, Spec. Proc. No. 3-93 (App. Div. 1993), concerning the wide latitude afforded to trial judges in the management of their calendars, the exacting standard that must be met to justify the intervention of this Court in such matters, and the extreme burdens that have been borne by Respondent over the past year and a half, are equally applicable here and compel the denial of this Petition as well.

Unfortunately, our statement in *BMC* concerning the failure of Petitioner's counsel to disclose all facts material to this **L333** Court's determination is also applicable here. Principally, the Petition filed fails to reveal that its request before the trial court for judicial action on the motions in question here has been opposed by one of the defendants in that matter on the ground that certain discovery disputes should be determined and further submissions based on that discovery should be permitted before any hearing is held on the potentially dispositive motions brought by Petitioner. Without intimating any view on that issue, such opposition confirms our view that "there are often compelling reasons to defer ruling on a motion", *Whipps v. Ngiraklsong*, Spec. Proc. No. 4-93 (App. Div. 1993), and our reluctance to interfere in such matters.

For all of the above reasons, it is
ORDERED, that the Petition for Writ of Mandamus be, and it hereby is DENIED.