IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

HARVEY STUMP, INDIVIDUALLY
AND AS CO-TRUSTEE OF THE H E S
LIVING TRUST; ELIZABETH M.
STUMP, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS COTRUSTEE OF THE H E S LIVING
TRUST; RAJA R. PUTHOOR,
INDIVIDUALLY AND AS CO-TRUSTEE
OF THE R & S REVOCABLE LIVING
TRUST; SUBITHA J. PUTHOOR,
INDIVIDUALLY AND AS CO-TRUSTEE
OF THE R & S REVOCABLE LIVING
TRUST; JAMES E. SIERK, AN
INDIVIDUAL; AND JANE O. SIERK,
AN INDIVIDUAL,
Appellants,

VS.

CITY OF HENDERSON, A NEVADA
POLITICAL SUBDIVISION; LAKE AT
LAS VEGAS JOINT VENTURE, LLC, A
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY; LAKE LAS VEGAS
RESORT SOUTHSHORE
RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY
ASSOCIATION, A NEVDA NONPROFIT CORPORATION; ROGER
WILLIAMSON, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND
MICHAEL TOBEY, AN INDIVIDUAL,
Respondents.

No. 51416

FILED

MAY 0 6 2008

TRACE K. LINDEMAN

CLERIOF SUPPLEME COURT

DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

This is an appeal from a district court oral pronouncement that vacated a temporary restraining order and denied a preliminary injunction.

Respondents have filed a motion to dismiss this appeal as premature since the district court has not reduced its oral pronouncement vacating appellants' temporary restraining order and denying them a preliminary injunction to a formal written order. Appellants have opposed the motion, essentially requesting that we hold this appeal in abeyance pending the district court's entry of an appealable written judgment.

A premature notice of appeal generally fails to vest jurisdiction in this court.¹ An appeal is rendered premature by the absence of a formal written order, since, before the district court enters a written order on its oral pronouncement, the court "remains free to reconsider and issue a written judgment different from its oral pronouncement."² Thus, "only a written judgment has any effect, and only a written judgment may be appealed."³

Based on the documents currently before us, no written order vacating appellants' temporary restraining order and denying them a

¹Rust v. Clark Cty. School District, 103 Nev. 686, 688, 747 P.2d 1380, 1381 (1987).

²Id. at 688, 747 P.2d at 1382.

³<u>Id.</u> at 689, 747 P.2d at 1382.

preliminary injunction exists. Because the decision challenged in this appeal has not been reduced to writing, appellants' appeal is premature and thus failed to vest jurisdiction in this court.⁴ Accordingly, as we lack jurisdiction to consider this appeal, we grant respondents' motion, and we ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.

Maupin

Cherry

Saitta

cc: Hon. Mark R. Denton, District Judge
Charles LoBello Law Offices
Groesbeck Group, Ltd.
Leach Johnson Song & Gruchow
Santoro, Driggs, Walch, Kearney, Holley & Thompson
William E. Cooper Law Offices
Eighth District Court Clerk

⁴See NRAP 4(a)(4) and (6).