

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE  
MATHEW HARTER, DISTRICT JUDGE,  
Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK; THE HONORABLE LISA M.  
BROWN, DISTRICT JUDGE; AND THE  
HONORABLE ELIZABETH GOFF  
GONZALEZ,

Respondents,

and

MARY JOHANNA RASMUSSEN; JULIE  
HAMMER; AND GONZALO GALINDO,  
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 73645

**FILED**

AUG 30 2017

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. Young  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION*

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition challenging the reassignment of a case to petitioner's judicial department. After District Judge Lisa M. Brown recused herself from a family law matter involving real parties in interest, the matter was reassigned to District Judge Mathew Harter's department. After Judge Harter entered an order reassigning the matter back to Judge Brown, District Judge Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, the Chief Judge of the Eighth Judicial District, entered an order concluding that Judge Harter's reassignment order was ineffective. Having considered the petition and supporting documents and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the recusal, we conclude that extraordinary intervention is not appropriate.

NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330; *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

Cherry, C.J.  
Cherry

Douglas, J.  
Douglas

Pickering, J.  
Pickering

cc: Hon. Lisa M. Brown, District Judge, Family Court Division  
Hon. Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, Chief Judge  
Mathew Harter  
Gonzalo Galindo  
Black & LoBello  
Julie Hammer  
Attorney General/Las Vegas  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>The motion of real party in interest Mary Rasmussen for a stay or similar relief is denied as moot; in light of this order, Judge Harter should lift the stay he imposed while this writ proceeding was pending and resolve the motions pending before him.

The guardian ad litem of the child whose custody is at issue between the real parties in interest submitted a response to Rasmussen's motion. While such submission was proper, and we thus direct the clerk to file the response received from the guardian ad litem on August 28, 2017, in light of our denial of the motion, we will take no further action on it.