

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MARY WILSON,
Petitioner,


vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR
THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE
HONORABLE KATHY A. HARDCASTLE,
DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
PATTI & SGRO, LTD.,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 47622

FILED


OCT 18 2006


JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order denying petitioner's motion to disqualify Senior Judge Pavlikowski. On July 18, 2006, Judge Pavlikowski recused himself from the underlying district court case, and in September 2006, Judge Pavlikowski resigned as a senior judge. Accordingly, this petition is now moot, and we dismiss it.¹

It is so ORDERED.


Becker, J.


Hardesty, J.


Parraguirre, J.

¹See NCAA v. University of Nevada, 97 Nev. 56, 624 P.2d 10 (1981). We vacate the temporary stay granted on July 14, 2006, and we deny petitioner's "motion for summary entry of requested writ" as moot in light of this order.

cc: Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial District
Hon. Joseph S. Pavlikowski, Senior Judge
Hon. Kathy A. Hardcastle, District Judge
Christina A. DiEdoardo
Patti & Sgro, P.C.
Clark County Clerk

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FRANCES DEANE,
Petitioner,

vs.

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

Respondents,

and

DAVID ROGER, DISTRICT
ATTORNEY,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 47957

FILED

OCT 18 2006

BY TE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION


This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges the district court's alleged refusal to dismiss or stay the underlying removal proceeding.

When it appeared that the removal proceeding might have concluded, we directed petitioner to show cause, within ten days from September 8, 2006, why this petition should not be dismissed as moot.¹ We construe petitioner's failure to respond to our directive as a concession


¹See NCAA v. University of Nevada, 97 Nev. 56, 624 P.2d 10 (1981).

that the removal proceeding has indeed concluded.² Accordingly, we dismiss this petition as moot.³

It is so ORDERED.


_____, J.
Becker


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Douglas W. Herndon, District Judge
C. Conrad Claus, A Prof. Corp.
Attorney General George Chanos/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney David J. Roger/Civil Division
Clark County Clerk

²We note that petitioner has filed a notice of appeal from a district court order removing her from office in the underlying matter. See Deane v. Roger, Docket No. 48145.

³In light of this order, petitioner's motions for a stay, to file a reply to the motion's opposition, and for expedited transcripts are denied as moot.