IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF: Z.S. AND C.P.

CLARK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES; AND CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Petitioners, vs. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,

IN AND FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE ROBERT TEUTON, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents, and

NICHOLE G.; Z.S., a Minor; AND C.P., a Minor, Real Parties in Interest. No. 88736 FILED JAN 27 2025 CLERK OR SUBRE FOR CALL DE LIZABETHA BROW CLERK OR SUBRE FOR CALL DE LIZABETHA BROW CLERK

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenging a district court order entered in NRS Chapter 432B proceedings accepting an admission to an allegation, dismissing two allegations, and setting a dispositional hearing.

Real party in interest Nichole G. has filed a motion to dismiss this matter as moot because Nichole has been reunited with her children and the district court has ended its jurisdiction and closed the case. In response, petitioners do not dispute that this matter is moot. They contend this matter should nevertheless not be dismissed because it falls into the capable-of-repetition-but-evading-review exception to the mootness doctrine.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA Having considered the motion, opposition, and reply, we conclude petitioners have not met their burden to demonstrate the exception applies. In particular, petitioners do not show that the issue presented will evade review because of time constraints or that the issue has ever occurred before or is likely to arise again. See Cashman Equip. Co. v. W. Edna Assocs., Ltd., 132 Nev. 689, 703, 380 P.3d 844, 853 (2016) ("The party seeking to overcome mootness must prove that (1) the duration of the challenged action is relatively short, (2) there is a likelihood that a similar issue will arise in the future, and (3) the matter is important." (internal quotation marks omitted)); Personhood Nev. v. Bristol, 126 Nev. 599, 603, 245 P.3d 572, 574-75 (2010) (rejecting a contention that an issue evaded review despite short statutory deadlines where the courts could expedite any challenges and resolve the issue before it became moot). Accordingly, the motion is granted and we

ORDER this matter DISMISSED.

Pickering, J. Pickering J.

	Pre	. J.
Lee	<u> </u>	,

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA cc: Hon. Robert Teuton, District Judge, Family Division Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney's Office The Grigsby Law Group Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc. Nevada Justice Group, Ltd. Eighth District Court Clerk

•