

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

WANE TE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Shoop*
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.