


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CEDRIC GREENE,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY  
OF LOS ANGELES,  
Respondent.

No. 88840-COA

**FILED**

FEB 12 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

This is an appeal from a district court order dismissing the underlying case for lack of personal and subject matter jurisdiction. First Judicial District Court, Carson City; James Todd Russell, Judge.

Greene, a California resident, initiated the underlying civil action against respondent Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (Housing Authority), which is a California government entity. In his complaint, Greene sought the immediate reinstatement of his Section 8 housing benefits as well as money damages.

On April 23, 2024, the Housing Authority moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of personal and subject matter jurisdiction and sought to have Greene declared a vexatious litigant. With regard to personal jurisdiction, the Housing Authority asserted that it is a California government entity operating only in Los Angeles, California and that it has zero contacts or connections to Nevada. It further noted that Greene's complaint does not allege that it has any connections to Nevada, nor does it allege the Housing Authority engaged in any activity in Nevada. In addition, the Housing Authority argued that the district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over the case as Greene failed to exhaust his

administrative remedies in California. The Housing Authority also requested that Greene be declared a vexatious litigant and that he be prohibited from filing any new actions against it in Nevada or filing further documents in existing cases where it is a defendant.

Greene did not file an opposition to the motion, but did request an extension of time to do so in a motion filed on May 6, 2024. No action was taken on Greene's extension request however, and, instead, on May 15, 2024, the district court entered an order granting the motion to dismiss and to declare Greene a vexatious litigant. The court found that the Housing Authority was a California agency with no offices in or contacts with Nevada. It also noted that Greene had filed a similar action against the Housing Authority in the Eighth Judicial District Court, which was dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction. Ultimately, the district court found that it lacked personal jurisdiction—general or specific—over the Housing Authority and granted the motion to dismiss on that basis. It also concluded dismissal on subject matter jurisdiction grounds was warranted based on Greene's failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

Additionally, after performing the four-part analysis under *Jordan v. State, Department of Motor Vehicles*, 121 Nev. 44, 110 P.3d 30 (2005), the district court declared that Greene was a vexatious litigant. As a result, the district court barred Greene from filing new actions against the Housing Authority in Nevada or making additional filings in existing Nevada cases against it. 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 fails to substantively address the personal jurisdictional grounds on which the district court dismissed his case, and he offers no cogent argument or explanation as to why he believes the district court erred by dismissing his case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *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”); *Edwards v. Emperor’s Garden Rest.*, 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (declining to consider issues that are not supported by cogent argument). Under these circumstances, Greene has failed to demonstrate that the district court erred in dismissing his case on these grounds, and we therefore affirm that determination.

With regard to the district court’s vexatious litigant order, Greene likewise fails to offer any cogent argument as to that issue, and thus we also affirm the district court’s decision in that regard. *See Edwards*, 122 Nev. at 330 n.38, 130 P.3d at 1288 n.38.

It is so ORDERED.

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

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

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

cc: First Judicial District Court, Department One  
Cedric Greene  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP/Las Vegas  
Carson City Clerk