


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA EX REL.
NEVADA REAL ESTATE DIVISION,
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND
INDUSTRY AND SHARATH
CHANDRA, ADMINISTRATOR,
Petitioners,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK
AND THE HONORABLE TINA TALIM,
Respondents,
and
JAMES SHARKEY, INDIVIDUALLY,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 90097-COA

FILED

APR 29 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DISMISSING PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS*

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order denying a motion to dismiss real party in interest's petition for judicial review and granting him leave to amend his petition.

On April 10, 2025, petitioners filed a notice of dismissal with this court, indicating that, a day earlier, the district court dismissed the underlying proceeding. Petitioners' notice included a copy of the district court's dismissal order as an attachment. We construe petitioners' notice as a motion to voluntarily withdraw their petition. See NRAP 42 (authorizing a petitioner to move to voluntarily dismiss a writ petition, which may be granted if the motion is uncontested).

Having reviewed petitioners' motion and because real party in interest has not filed any response in opposition, we conclude that the dismissal of the underlying proceeding rendered petitioners' petition for a

25-18924

writ of mandamus moot. *See Personhood Nev. v. Bristol*, 126 Nev. 599, 602, 245 P.3d 572, 574 (2010) (explaining that “a controversy must be present through all stages of the proceeding, and even though a case may present a live controversy at its beginning, subsequent events may render the case moot”) (internal citations omitted). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DISMISSED.¹


_____, C.J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Tina Talim, District Judge
Attorney General/Carson City
Attorney General/Reno
James Theodore Sharkey
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹Having considered real party in interest’s motion for the imposition of sanctions and other related penalties against petitioners’ counsel, the opposition, and reply, we conclude relief is not warranted and deny the motion. *See* NRAP 38.