


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SYED KHALID ABUBAKER,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
VINCENT OCHOA, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
SANA ABUBAKER,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 83741-COA

FILED

NOV 19 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DENYING PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION*

This emergency writ petition challenges an October 25, 2021, oral ruling denying petitioner's motion for summary judgment, which sought to invalidate a June 8, 2021, order to show cause why he should not be held in contempt. Petitioner asserts that the district court lacks authority to proceed with the contempt hearing, which apparently commenced on October 25 but was continued until November 12, because the "stipulation and order" underlying the contempt allegations was never signed and filed or included as an attachment to the July 19, 2020, order referring to it.

Having reviewed the petition and its supporting documents, we are not persuaded that our extraordinary and discretionary intervention is warranted at this time. *Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (observing that the party seeking writ relief bears the burden of showing such relief is warranted); *Smith v. Eighth*

Judicial Dist. Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 679, 818 P.2d 849, 851, 853 (1991) (recognizing that writ relief is an extraordinary remedy and that this court has discretion in determining whether to entertain a writ petition). This court generally will not consider writ petitions challenging oral rulings not reflected in a signed and filed written order, *see Rust v. Clark Cty. Sch. Dist.*, 103 Nev. 686, 688-89, 747 P.2d 1380, 1382 (1987) (recognizing that an oral ruling is ineffective for any purpose), or those challenging orders denying summary judgment motions, *Smith v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 113 Nev. 1343, 1344, 950 P.2d 280, 281 (1997). Moreover, to the extent petitioner challenges the contempt proceedings directly, this writ petition appears premature, as the district court has not yet resolved the contempt motion. Accordingly, without prejudice to petitioner's ability to challenge any future order holding him in contempt in a proper appeal or writ petition, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Bulla

cc: Hon. Vincent Ochoa, District Judge
Jones & LoBello
The Abrams & Mayo Law Firm
Eighth District Court Clerk