IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ECHO BAY MANAGEMENT
CORPORATION, A DELAWARE
CORPORATION; ECHO BAY
EXPLORATION, INC., A DELAWARE
CORPORATION; ECHO BAY MINES,
LTD., A CANADIAN CORPORATION;
AND KINROSS GOLD CORPORATION,
A CANADIAN CORPORATION,
A CANADIAN CORPORATION,
Appellants,

vs.
THE HOWARD HUGHES
CORPORATION F/K/A SUMMA
CORPORATION, A DELAWARE
CORPORATION,
Respondent.

No. 43350

FILED

DEC 0 6 2006



ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a district court order denying a motion to change venue in a fraud action. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Mark R. Denton, Judge. We presume that the parties are familiar with the facts and do not further recite them.

We review a district court's decision on venue for an abuse of discretion.¹ Under NRS 13.040, venue is proper where one or more defendants reside. Defendants can move for a change of venue under NRS 13.050. If a defendant timely moves for a change of venue on the basis of

(O) 1947A

¹Fabbi v. First National Bank, 62 Nev. 405, 413-14, 153 P.2d 122, 125 (1944); Williams v. Keller, 6 Nev. 141, 144 (1870).

residence, then a change of venue is mandatory unless the current venue is a proper venue. 2

A corporation's residence depends on its status as a foreign or domestic corporation. A foreign corporation must first register with the Secretary of State and then establish a principal place of business in Nevada.³ If the foreign corporation does not register with the Secretary of State, then it is deemed to have "not established residency in any particular county for venue purposes" and venue is proper in any county.⁴ Once it has registered with the Secretary of State, then the foreign corporation must establish, as its residence, a principal place of business in Nevada.⁵ A domestic corporation's residence is determined by the residence stated in its filings with the Secretary of State or by its principal place of business.⁶

We have considered all the arguments of Kinross and the Echo Bay entities on appeal and conclude they are without merit. Therefore, we

²Western Pacific Railroad v. Krom, 102 Nev. 40, 42-43, 714 P.2d 182, 184 (1986); Williams, 6 Nev. at 144.

³NRS 80.010; NRS 80.210; <u>Marshall Earth Resources v. Parks</u>, 99 Nev. 251, 252-53, 661 P.2d 875, 876 (1983).

⁴Marshall Earth Resources, 99 Nev. at 252-53, 661 P.2d at 876.

⁵See Byers v. Graton, 82 Nev. 92, 95, 411 P.2d 480, 481 (1966).

⁶Flournoy v. McKinnon Ford Sales, 90 Nev. 119, 121, 520 P.2d 600, 601-02 (1974).

conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion when it denied their motion for a change of venue. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.

Gibbons

Maupin J

Douglas, J.

cc: Hon. Mark R. Denton, District Judge
Howard Roitman, Settlement Judge
Hale Lane Peek Dennison & Howard/Las Vegas
DLA Piper US LLP/Las Vegas
DLA Piper US LLP/Los Angeles
Mark H. Gunderson, Ltd.
Clark County Clerk