

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA


CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS AND  
CCMSI,  
Appellants,  
vs.  
SAMUEL ENRIQUEZ,  
Respondent.

No. 89935

**FILED**

**JUN 30 2025**

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

**ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL**

This is an appeal from a district court order granting a petition for judicial review. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Veronica Barisich, Judge.

Initial review of the notice of appeal and documents before this court revealed a potential jurisdictional defect. In particular, it appeared the challenged district court order is not substantively appealable because it does not finally resolve the issues presented. *See Lee v. GNLV Corp.*, 116 Nev. 424, 426, 996 P.2d 416, 417 (2000) (“[A] final judgment is one that disposes of all the issues presented in the case, and leaves nothing for the future consideration of the court, except for post-judgment issues such as attorney’s fees and costs.”). Instead, the district court remanded the matter for further substantive proceedings. *See Clark County Liquor v. Clark*, 102 Nev. 654, 730 P.2d 443 (1986) (holding that no appeal lies from an order remanding a case to an administrative body for further proceedings). Thus, this court ordered appellants to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Appellants assert in response that use of the word “remand” does not automatically render the district court’s order a non-final order. Although appellants’ point is fair, *see Bally’s Grand Hotel & Casino v.*

*Reeves*, 112 Nev. 1487, 1488, 929 P.2d 936, 937 (1996), the order in this case remands the matter for substantive proceedings to resolve a contested issue, *cf. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. O'Brien*, 129 Nev. 679, 680-81, 310 P.3d 581, 582 (2013) (“[A] district court order remanding a matter to an administrative agency is not an appealable order, unless the order constitutes a final judgment on the merits and remands merely for collateral tasks, such as calculating benefits found due.”); *State Taxicab Authority v. Greenspun*, 109 Nev. 1022, 862 P.2d 423 (1993) (rejecting adoption of the collateral order doctrine for Nevada). Accordingly, we lack jurisdiction and

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pickering J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cadish J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lee J.

cc: Hon. Veronica Barisich, District Judge  
Janet Trost, Settlement Judge  
Hooks Meng & Clement  
GGRM Law Firm  
Eighth District Court Clerk