## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SHARNETTE HAMMOND,

Appellant,

vs.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT; AND CANNON COCHRAN MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC.,

Respondents.

No. 72248

FILED

DEC 0 1 2017

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY S. YOUNG

DEPUTY CLERK

## ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This is an appeal from a district court order granting a petition for judicial review. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Douglas Smith, Judge.

Our initial review of the docketing statement and documents before this court revealed that the notice of appeal may have been untimely filed. Notice of entry of the challenged order was served by mail on December 7, 2016. However, the notice of appeal was not filed in the district court until January 24, 2017, well after the expiration of the 30-day period for filing the notice of appeal established by NRAP 4(a)(1). Accordingly, we directed appellant to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. See Healy v. Volkswagenwerk, 103 Nev. 329, 741 P.2d 432 (1987) (an untimely notice of appeal fails to vest jurisdiction in this court).

In response, counsel for appellant asserted that he never received the notice of entry of order and was first made aware of it when he accessed the district court's online database on January 22, 2017. Respondents disputed the existence of any service defect. When an appellant asserts that he or she did not receive written notice of entry of the

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

appealed order, "there is a legitimate question of fact as to whether the notice was ever mailed." Zugel v. Miller, 99 Nev. 100, 101, 659 P.2d 296, 297 (1983). We thus remanded this matter to the district court to determine the factual question of whether respondents mailed the notice of entry of order to appellant on December 7, 2016, as indicated in the certificate of mailing. See id. (this court is not a fact-finding tribunal).

The district court has now filed a copy of a November 3, 2017, order in which it states that the notice of entry of order "was properly mailed to and served upon [appellant] by mail on December 7, 2016." Accordingly, the notice of appeal was untimely filed in the district court on January 24, 2017, 48 days after notice of entry of the order was served. We conclude that we lack jurisdiction, and we

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.

Hardesty, J

Parraguirre

Stiglich, J.

In her response to our order to show cause, appellant asked that this court accept jurisdiction because she did not receive a copy of the challenged order when it was entered, she detrimentally relied upon an assertion by the district court judge that the petition would not be ruled upon until sometime after January 9, 2017, and public policy favors hearing this case on its merits. However, as noted in our July 21, 2017, order of limited remand, the timely filing of a notice of appeal is mandatory and jurisdictional, and we are not authorized to extend the time to file the notice of appeal under these circumstances. See NRAP 4(a)(1); NRAP 26(b)(1)(A).

cc: Hon. Douglas Smith, District Judge Carolyn Worrell, Settlement Judge Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers/Las Vegas Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP/Las Vegas Eighth District Court Clerk