


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ALISHA RUMLEY,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
NADIN CUTTER, DISTRICT COURT
JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
NICHOLAS NOTHEM,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 89875-COA

FILED

JAN 02 2025


ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY: 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING EMERGENCY PETITION


This original emergency petition for writs of mandamus and prohibition challenges a district court minute order denying a motion to quash service and to dismiss, and addressing various other issues, in a child custody matter. Petitioner has not provided a written, file-stamped order, which precludes our review. *See Div. of Child & Fam. Servs. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 445, 451, 92 P.3d 1239, 1243 (2004); *Rust v. Clark Cnty. Sch. Dist.*, 103 Nev. 686, 689, 747 P.2d 1380, 1382 (1987) (providing that a minute order is not effective for any purpose). Further, having considered the petition and appendices, without a written order, we cannot conclude that petitioner has met her burden of demonstrating that extraordinary writ relief is warranted at this time. *See Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004) (providing that petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted); *Smith v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (explaining that it is within this court's sole discretion to determine if a writ

petition will be considered). Finally, it does not appear that this petition warrants emergency treatment to preserve petitioner's jurisdictional challenge—it was preserved via her motion to quash service of process. See *Hosp. Corp. of Am. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 112 Nev. 1159, 1161 n.2, 924 P.2d 725, 726 n.2 (1996) (stating that “so long as the personal jurisdiction issue is properly presented to the district court prior to trial,” it is preserved despite any further appearances before the court). Accordingly, we deny this writ petition without prejudice to petitioner's ability to file a new petition challenging a written, file-stamped order, if deemed appropriate.

It is so ORDERED.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Nadin Cutter, District Judge, Family Division
Candelaria Law Group
At Ease Law
Eighth District Court Clerk