



IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JEREMY JON HERRMANN,
Appellant,
v.
KELLY NICOLE HERRMANN,
Respondent.

No. 92238-COA

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Jeremy Jon Herrmann appeals from a district court final order in a child custody matter. Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; Hon. Sandra A. Unsworth, Judge.

Jeremy and respondent Kelly Nicole Herrmann were married in 2007 and share two minor children. In December 2021, Kelly filed a complaint for divorce seeking sole legal and primary physical custody of the parties' minor children. The district court entered a decree of divorce in April 2022, awarding Kelly sole legal and primary physical custody of the children. In the decree, the district court also granted Kelly's request to relocate to California with the children. Kelly and the children thereafter moved to California. However, Kelly later relocated to Pennsylvania with the children. Kelly subsequently initiated proceedings in Pennsylvania to modify the custody arrangement.

The parties thereafter filed motions concerning ongoing custody disputes, including Kelly's relocation to Pennsylvania with the children. In Nevada, Kelly moved the district court to relinquish jurisdiction, arguing that the parties and the children no longer resided in Nevada and noting the ongoing court proceedings in Pennsylvania. In addition, Jeremy acknowledged that he was not residing in Nevada at that time.

After a hearing, the district court entered orders in April 2024 in which it determined it no longer had jurisdiction over the custody proceedings as the children and the parties no longer resided in Nevada. The district court also explained that it conferred with the Pennsylvania court assigned to the custody proceedings in that state and the courts agreed that the Pennsylvania court had assumed jurisdiction over the custody proceedings.

Jeremy appealed from entry of the orders, but this court affirmed the district court's decision. *Herrmann v. Herrmann*, No. 88635-COA, 2024 WL 4274107 (Nev. Ct. App. Sep. 20, 2024) (Order of Affirmance). This court concluded "the district court properly determined that Nevada lost continuing, exclusive jurisdiction over the parties' child custody dispute as the parties and the children no longer resided in Nevada." *Id.* at *2. This court further explained "Jeremy has failed to offer any cogent argument demonstrating that the district court's decision to relinquish jurisdiction to Pennsylvania was improper under the circumstances presented here." *Id.* at *3.

In December 2025, Jeremy filed a motion in which he challenged the district court's April 2024 orders concerning relinquishing jurisdiction to Pennsylvania and sought reconsideration of the court's related custody decisions. Jeremy contended that the district court failed to follow proper procedures for relinquishing jurisdiction to Pennsylvania under NRS Chapter 125A such that the April 2024 orders were void. He also asserted that the district court, in relinquishing jurisdiction to Pennsylvania, violated his right to due process and failed to protect the children from Kelly's improper relocation to Pennsylvania.

The district court subsequently entered an order denying Jeremy's motion, determining that Jeremy's contentions have already been considered and rejected. This appeal follows.

On appeal, Jeremy argues the April 2024 orders are void due to the district court's failure to follow the procedures contained within NRS Chapter 125A to properly relinquish jurisdiction to Pennsylvania and asserts the district court erroneously declined to reevaluate its decision to relinquish jurisdiction.

We review a district court's decision to deny a motion for reconsideration or to set aside for abuse of discretion. *AA Primo Builders, LLC v. Washington*, 126 Nev. 578, 589, 245 P.3d 1190, 1197 (2010) (reviewing a district court's decision resolving a motion for reconsideration for an abuse of discretion); *see also In re Harrison Living Tr.*, 121 Nev. 217, 224, 112 P.3d 1058, 1062 (2005) (reviewing a district court's decision concerning a motion brought under NRCP 60(b)(4) seeking to set aside a void judgment for an abuse of discretion). While this court reviews factual findings deferentially, it reviews conclusions of law de novo. *Kilgore v. Kilgore*, 135 Nev. 357, 359-60, 449 P.3d 843, 846 (2019). "Reconsideration may be appropriate where a party introduces substantially different evidence or the court's decision is clearly erroneous." *Saticoy Bay, LLC v. Thornburg Mortg. Sec. Tr. 2007-3*, 138 Nev. 335, 344, 510 P.3d 139, 146 (2022). Moreover, [f]or a judgment to be void, there must be a defect in the court's authority to enter judgment through either lack of personal jurisdiction or jurisdiction over subject matter in the suit." *Gassett v. Snappy Car Rental*, 111 Nev. 1416, 1419, 906 P.2d 258, 261 (1995), *superseded in part by rule as stated in In re Estate of Black*, 132 Nev. 73, 76, 367 P.3d 416, 418 (2016).

As noted previously, this court has already considered a challenge to the April 2024 orders and affirmed the district court's decision to relinquish jurisdiction to Pennsylvania. *See Herrmann*, No. 88635-COA, 2024 WL 4274107, at *3 ("[W]e discern no basis to disturb the district court's decision to

relinquish jurisdiction to Pennsylvania.”). This court’s decision to affirm the district court’s decision is the law of the case. “Under the law-of-the-case doctrine, a legal decision made at one stage of a criminal or civil proceeding should remain the law of that case throughout the litigation, unless and until the decision is modified or overruled by a higher court.” *Litchfield v. Tucson Ridge Homeowners Ass’n*, 140 Nev., Adv. Op. 57, 555 P.3d 267, 270 (2024). Moreover, “[u]nder the law of the case doctrine, when an appellate court states a principle or rule of law necessary to a decision, the principle or rule becomes the law of the case and must be followed throughout its subsequent progress, both in the lower court and upon subsequent appeal.” *Hsu v. Cnty. of Clark*, 123 Nev. 625, 629-30, 173 P.3d 724, 728 (2007) (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). “The doctrine is designed to ensure judicial consistency and to prevent the reconsideration . . . of those decisions which are intended to put a particular matter to rest.” *Litchfield*, 140 Nev., Adv. Op. 57, 555 P.3d at 270 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Here, even though Jeremy has previously challenged the district court’s decision to relinquish jurisdiction to Pennsylvania, he again challenges that decision, presenting more detailed and specific arguments as to why he believes that decision was improper. However, “the doctrine of the law of the case cannot be avoided by a more detailed and precisely focused argument subsequently made after reflection upon the previous proceedings.” *Hall v. State*, 91 Nev. 314, 316, 535 P.2d 797, 799 (1975). Thus, Jeremy’s arguments are barred by the law of the case doctrine, and he does not provide a compelling reason to revisit this court’s prior decision. *See Litchfield*, 140 Nev., Adv. Op. 57, 555 P.3d at 270-71 (discussing exceptions to the doctrine of the law of the case). Therefore, we conclude Jeremy fails to demonstrate the district court abused its discretion by denying his motion. *See AA Primo Builders, LLC*, 126

Nev. at 589, 245 P.3d at 1197; *In re Harrison Living Tr.*, 121 Nev. at 224, 112 P.3d at 1062. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.¹



Bulla, C.J.



Gibbons, J.



Westbrook, J.

cc: Hon. Sandra A. Unsworth, District Judge
Jeremy Jon Herrmann
Kelly Nicole Herrmann
Washoe District Court Clerk

¹Insofar as Jeremy raises arguments that are not specifically addressed in this order, we have considered the same and conclude that they do not present a basis for relief. In addition, we have reviewed Jeremy's motion filed on July 30, 2026, and conclude that no relief requested therein is warranted.