


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ALLANNA WARREN,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
CANO HEALTH,  
Respondent.

No. 87798-COA

FILED  
DEC 30 2024  
ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

Allanna Warren appeals from a district court order dismissing her complaint. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Maria A. Gall, Judge.

In the instant case, Warren filed a civil action against respondent Cano Health in which she asserted various negligence claims. After Warren filed several successive motions to recuse the sitting judge and the chief judge in this matter, Cano Health successfully requested that the district court hold a supervised early case conference.

Although Warren was served with the district court's order scheduling the conference for October 20, 2023, at 10:00 am, Warren did not appear. Accordingly, the court continued the conference to November 17, 2023, including a written warning in the order that if Warren failed to appear at that conference, it would issue an order to show cause as to why the case should not be dismissed for failure to appear and attend the early case conference. Warren did not appear at the November 17 conference, and so the court issued an order to show cause directing her to appear on

December 18, 2023, to show cause as to why the court should not dismiss her case. Warren also failed to appear at the show cause hearing, despite the court trailing the matter and calling the case twice. Accordingly, the court entered an order dismissing the case without prejudice, stating that “[b]y her failure to appear, Ms. Warren has, by definition, failed to show cause.” Warren now appeals.

In her informal brief, Warren presents several arguments related to interlocutory decisions of the district court, including the court’s denial of her motion for default judgment, the denial of her motion to recuse the sitting judge, and, after that denial, the denial of her motion to recuse the chief judge, who had ruled on her prior recusal motion. However, she fails to present any arguments challenging the district court’s dismissal order or to even acknowledge, much less address, the court’s reasoning for dismissing her complaint without prejudice. Accordingly, any such challenges are waived. *See Powell v. Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co.*, 127 Nev. 156, 161 n.3, 252 P.3d 668, 672 n.3 (2011) (“Issues not raised in an appellant’s opening brief are deemed waived.”).

And given her waiver of any arguments related to the dismissal order, we need not address Warren’s challenges to the district court’s various interlocutory decisions. Nonetheless, with regard to Warren’s arguments related to the district court judge’s and chief judge’s refusal to recuse from the underlying proceedings, which are based on the fact that these judges made unfavorable rulings towards her, we note that such arguments do not present a basis for relief. *See Canarelli v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 138 Nev. 104, 109, 506 P.3d 334, 339 (2022) (concluding that

generally what a judge learns during the performance of his or her duties “does not warrant disqualification unless the judge forms an opinion that displays a deep-seated favoritism or antagonism that would make fair judgment impossible” (internal quotation marks omitted)). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>1</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Bulla

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Maria A. Gall, District Judge  
Allanna Warren  
Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker, LLP/Las Vegas  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>In light of this order, we deny as moot Warren’s December 27, 2024, motion to expedite.