


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
JERRY A. WIESE, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
NORTH LAS VEGAS POLICE
SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION, A
LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE
ORGANIZATION,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 69938

FILED

MAR 25 2016

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER DENYING PETITION


This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenging a district court order that, in part, denied petitioner's motion to dismiss the complaint of real party in interest or, alternatively, for summary judgment. Specifically, petitioner requests that this court compel the district court to vacate its order to the extent it denied petitioner's requests for relief and direct it to grant one of the motions or prohibit the district court from taking further action until the real party in interest exhausts certain other procedures. Petitioner has also filed motions requesting that this court stay all district court proceedings pending resolution of the petition, vacate a district court hearing, and quash a subpoena.

The motions and accompanying appendix indicate that after the petition was filed, the district court granted reconsideration and vacated the order that is the subject of the petition, and is reserving ruling

on the parties' motions until after a hearing scheduled for March 31. Thus, the issues the petition asks this court to review, including the justiciability of real party in interest's complaint, remain open, making this court's intervention at this time premature. And we are not otherwise persuaded that this court's intervention by way of extraordinary writ is warranted at this time. See NRS34.170; NRS 34.330, *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004). In so concluding, we are confident that the district court will first resolve the questions regarding justiciability of the complaint and only proceed to the other issues raised if it is indeed justiciable. In light of the foregoing, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹


_____, J.
Hardesty


_____, J.
Saitta


_____, J.
Pickering

¹In light of this denial, petitioner's motion for stay is moot. Further, this court will not manage the district court's calendar, nor will it entertain a challenge to a district court order denying a motion to quash a subpoena by way of a motion filed in this court. Accordingly, all motions are denied.

cc: Hon. Jerry A. Wiese, District Judge
North Las Vegas City Attorney
Armstrong Teasdale, LLP/Las Vegas
Law Office of Daniel Marks
Eighth District Court Clerk