


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CEDRIC GREENE,
Appellant,
vs.
NEXT DOOR MEDICAL NETWORK,
INC.,
Respondent.

No. 88373-COA

FILED

OCT 29 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Cedric Greene appeals from a district court order dismissing his civil action for lack of jurisdiction. First Judicial District Court, Carson City; James Todd Russell, Judge.

Greene, a California resident, filed the underlying action in the First Judicial District Court against respondent Next Door Medical Network, Inc., a California entity. According to Greene's complaint, he presented to Next Door to obtain a medical referral, but the processing of this request was delayed due to Next Door's failure to timely submit the request. Based on this delay, Greene asserted he was entitled to \$75,000 in damages. Following various other filings by Greene, the district court entered an order dismissing the case, without prejudice, based on a lack of personal jurisdiction over Next Door. This appeal followed.

We review a district court's resolution of issues pertaining to its exercise of jurisdiction over a case or a party de novo. *See Ogawa v. Ogawa*, 125 Nev. 660, 667, 221 P.3d 699, 704 (2009); *Baker v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 116 Nev. 527, 531, 999 P.2d 1020, 1023 (2000).


On appeal, Greene emphasizes that he has been declared a vexatious litigant in California and cannot litigate cases there, nor does he

wish to do so. He asserts that, given these circumstances, the Nevada courts should take steps to allow him to bring his case in this state. But in making this argument, Greene fails to substantively address the jurisdictional grounds on which the district court dismissed his case or explain how or why Nevada could properly exercise jurisdiction over a California company such as Next Door under the circumstances presented here. Thus, Greene has waived any challenge to the district court's conclusions on this point, *see Powell v. Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co.*, 127 Nev. 156, 161 n.3, 252 P.3d 668, 672 n.3 (2011) (providing that "[i]ssues not raised in an appellant's opening brief are deemed waived"), and has failed to otherwise offer a cogent argument as to why reversal of the challenged order is warranted, *see Edwards v. Emperor's Garden Rest.*, 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (providing that this court need consider claims that are unsupported by cogent arguments). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's dismissal of Greene's case.¹

It is so ORDERED.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Westbrook

¹Insofar as Greene raises arguments that are not specifically addressed in this order, we have considered the same and conclude that they do not present a basis for relief.

cc: Hon. James Todd Russell, District Judge
Cedric Greene
Next Door Medical Network, Inc.
Carson City Clerk