

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROGER ALLEN KENIS,

Appellant,

vs.

MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL, A  
DELAWARE CORPORATION;  
MANDALAY RESORT GROUP, A  
NEVADA COMPANY; MANDALAY BAY  
LLC, F/K/A MANDALAY CORP., A  
NEVADA LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY; MGM RESORTS FESTIVAL  
GROUNDS, LLC, A NEVADA  
DOMESTIC LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY; AND MGM RESORTS  
VENUE MANAGEMENT, LLC, A  
NEVADA LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY,  
Respondents.

No. 90962

**FILED**

**SEP 10 2025**

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

*ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL*

This is a pro se appeal of a district court indicative order on a motion to reconsider. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Jerry A. Wiese, Judge.

This case arises from a personal injury action that was dismissed on January 20, 2022, after the district court granted respondents' motion for summary judgment. Thereafter, appellant filed several post-judgment motions, including several motions for relief pursuant to NRCP 60(d)(3). The most recent NRCP 60(d)(3) motion was denied by the district court on June 4, 2025. Appellant appealed from that order and it is currently under review in Docket No. 90756. Despite filing a notice of appeal from that order, appellant filed a motion to reconsider the district court's June 4, 2025, order on June 9, 2025. On July 9, 2025, appellant filed

an emergency motion for stay in Docket No. 90756 pending the district court's resolution of the June 9, 2025, motion to reconsider. On July 11, 2025, this court issued an order in Docket No. 90756 denying appellant's July 9, 2025, motion. In that order, this court noted that because appellant properly filed his notice of appeal from the June 4 order on June 5, "the district court was at that time divested of jurisdiction to alter the June 4 order." On the same day, the district court issued an indicative ruling on appellant's motion to reconsider pursuant to *Huneycutt v. Huneycutt*, 94 Nev. 79, 575 P.2d 585 (1978) and *Foster v. Dingwall*, 126 Nev. 56, 227 P.3d 1042, 1052 (2010). The district court noted that "[b]ecause this Court has been divested of jurisdiction, the best that the Court can do is to enter this *Huneycutt* order, indicating that if the Court had jurisdiction, the Court would deny Plaintiff's Motion." On the same day the district court issued the indicative ruling, appellant filed the instant appeal.

No court rule or statute allows for an appeal from a district court's indicative order. *Brown v. MHC Stagecoach*, 129 Nev. 343, 345, 301 P.3d 850, 851 (2013) ("[W]e may only consider appeals authorized by statute or court rule."). Accordingly, we lack jurisdiction and

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.

Pickering, J.  
Pickering

Cadish, J.  
Cadish

Lee, J.  
Lee

cc: Hon. Jerry A. Wiese, Chief Judge  
Roger Allen Kenis  
Pisanelli Bice, PLLC  
Eighth District Court Clerk