

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JANET GREESON, AN INDIVIDUAL;
PAUL BURKETTE, AN INDIVIDUAL;
WELTER HOLDEN, AN INDIVIDUAL;
CYNTHIA THOMPSON, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TOM WINN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; ALBERT WOLLEN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; EUGENE BOYLE, AN
INDIVIDUAL; RICHARD ROSSI, AN
INDIVIDUAL; AND
STEROIDOGENESIS INHIBITORS
INTERNATIONAL, A NEVADA
CORPORATION,
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE
MARK R. DENTON, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
ALFRED T. SAPSE,
Real Party in Interest.

JANET GREESON, AN INDIVIDUAL;
PAUL BURKETTE, AN INDIVIDUAL;
WELTER HOLDEN, AN INDIVIDUAL;
CYNTHIA THOMPSON, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TOM WINN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; ALBERT WOLLEN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; EUGENE BOYLE, AN
INDIVIDUAL; RICHARD ROSSI, AN
INDIVIDUAL; AND
STEROIDOGENESIS INHIBITORS
INTERNATIONAL, A NEVADA
CORPORATION,
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE

No. 37179

FILED

DEC 16 2002

JANET FLOREN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Richard*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

No. 37180

MARK R. DENTON, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
ALFRED T. SAPSE,
Real Party in Interest.

ORDER DISMISSING PETITIONS FOR A WRIT OF PROHIBITION
AND FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS


These consolidated writ petitions arise from a district court proceeding to compel petitioners to hold a shareholders' meeting to elect a new board of directors. Previously, these matters were consolidated with three related appeals (Docket Nos. 37042, 37160, and 37273), in which petitioners, as appellants, appeared to challenge the same actions or orders of the district court. The three related appeals were dismissed in August 2002, pursuant to appellants/petitioners' voluntary motion for dismissal on the ground that a shareholders' meeting had taken place, and the district court had entered summary judgment in petitioners' favor. In light of these developments, we issued an order directing petitioners to show cause why these petitions should not be dismissed as moot.

In response, petitioners acknowledge that these petitions are moot and have filed notices indicating that they desire to withdraw the petitions. We elect to treat the notices as motions to voluntarily dismiss the petitions, and we grant the motions. Accordingly, we dismiss these petitions.

It is so ORDERED.


_____, J.
Shearing


_____, J.
Leavitt


_____, J.
Becker

cc: Hon. Mark R. Denton, District Judge
Marquis & Aurbach
Alfred T. Sapse
Clark County Clerk