IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DIEGO ARMANDO SALAZAR, Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent. No. 68403

FILED

JAN 24 2018

CLERK OF SUPREME COUR
BY SUPPLEMENT OF SUPPL

ORDER OF REVERSAL AND REMAND

This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction, pursuant to a jury verdict, of second-degree kidnapping and sexual assault of a minor under 14 years of age. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Douglas Smith, Judge.

Appellant Diego Armando Salazar contends that the district court committed structural error when it failed to comply with NRS 16.030(5) and administer the oath to the jury venire before voir dire over his objection. The record reflects that both Salazar and the State raised the issue with the district court prior to voir dire, but the district court refused to administer the oath. We recently held that failure to administer the oath to potential jurors where, as here, both sides called the NRS 16.030(5) error to the district court's attention is an error requiring reversal. See Barral v. State, 131 Nev., Adv. Op. 52, 353 P.3d 1197, 1200 (2015), cert. denied, _____ U.S. ____, 136 S. Ct. 2542 (2016). Because the district court did not comply with NRS 16.030(5), we

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A -

18-03478

ORDER the judgment of conviction REVERSED AND REMAND this matter to the district court for a new trial.¹

Pickering)

Gibbons

Hardesty J.

cc: Hon. Douglas Smith, District Judge Clark County Public Defender Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney Eighth District Court Clerk

(O) 1947A

¹We further hold that when viewed in the light most favorable to the State, a rational trier of fact could have found Salazar guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of these charges. <u>Milton v. State</u>, 111 Nev. 1487, 1491, 908 P.2d 684, 687 (1995). Because we reverse Salazar's conviction on the ground that the district court committed structural error, we decline to address the remaining issues in this appeal.