


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

HARDEEP SULL, NEVADA BAR NO.  
12108,  
Petitioner,  
vs.  
STATE BAR OF NEVADA, A PUBLIC  
CORPORATION AND DANIEL M.  
HOOGE, BAR COUNSEL, STATE BAR  
OF NEVADA,  
Respondents.

No. 89749

**FILED**

SEP 12 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY  DEPUTY CLERK


*ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION*


This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges publication and enforcement of a public reprimand issued in an attorney discipline matter. On August 22, 2024, we reprimanded petitioner Hardeep Sull. Remittitur issued in that matter. But because good cause was shown, remittitur was recalled and Sull was permitted to file a petition for rehearing and then a petition for en banc reconsideration. On August 28, 2025, we granted Sull's petition for en banc reconsideration and issued a revised opinion reprimanding Sull. *In re Discipline of Sull*, 141 Nev., Adv. Op. 43 (Aug. 28, 2025).


This writ petition seeks an order requiring the State Bar to withdraw its publication of the August 22, 2024, public reprimand and issuance of a Memorandum of Costs. We conclude that the opinion granting the petition for en banc reconsideration and reprimanding Sull has rendered this writ petition 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" (citations omitted)). Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED as moot.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Herndon

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Bell

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Stiglich

cc: Richard Harris Law Firm  
State Bar of Nevada/Las Vegas