



IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

UNITED JET SALES, INC.,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
JACOB A. REYNOLDS, DISTRICT
JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
CLARK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
AVIATION,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 92129-COA

ORDER DENYING PETITION

This is an original petition for a writ of mandamus, prohibition, or certiorari challenging a district court order affirming a summary eviction in the justice court.

A writ of mandamus is available to compel the performance of an act that the law requires as a duty resulting from an office, NRS 34.160, or to control an arbitrary or capricious exercise of discretion, *Int'l Game Tech., Inc. v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008). A writ of prohibition arrests the proceedings of a tribunal that is acting in excess of, or without, jurisdiction. NRS 34.320. Moreover, a writ of certiorari is available to confine an inferior tribunal, board, or officer exercising judicial functions to the limits of its jurisdiction. NRS 34.020(2). The decision to entertain a petition for extraordinary writ relief is within our sole discretion, and the petitioner has the burden of demonstrating that such relief is warranted. *Pan v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 120 Nev. 222, 228, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004).

Based on our review of the writ petition and the documents before us, we conclude petitioner United Jet Sales, Inc. (UJS), has not demonstrated that our extraordinary intervention is warranted. *Id.* “The Nevada Constitution vests the district court with final appellate jurisdiction in all cases arising in the justices’ courts.” *Id.* at 227, 88 P.3d at 843; *see* Nev. Const. art. 6, § 6. As a general rule, this court will decline to consider writ petitions that request review of a district court’s decision when acting in its appellate capacity, save for a few exceptions. *State v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. (Hedland)*, 116 Nev. 127, 134, 994 P.2d 692, 696-97 (2000) (stating that generally, appellate courts decline to consider writs seeking extraordinary relief “unless the district court has improperly refused to exercise its jurisdiction, has exceeded its jurisdiction, or has exercised its discretion in an arbitrary or capricious manner”); *see also Kotab v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, No. 87854, 2024 WL 119659, at *1 (Nev. Jan. 10, 2024) (Order Denying Petition for Writ of Certiorari and/or Mandamus) (determining that “petitioner has not shown that deviating from the general rule against reviewing a district court’s appellate decision is appropriate” despite “argument concerning the justice court’s jurisdiction over the summary eviction proceedings”).

UJS contends that the real party in interest, Clark County Department of Aviation (CCDA), pursued a remedy that was unavailable in the circumstances below, which it argues deprived the justice court of jurisdiction. Justice courts have jurisdiction over “actions for the possession of lands and tenements where the relation of landlord and tenant exists, when damages claimed do not exceed \$15,000 or when no damages are claimed.” NRS 4.370(1)(g). CCDA sought to evict UJS from a leased hangar for failure to abide by the terms of the lease; it did not seek damages. Accordingly, the justice court had jurisdiction to adjudicate the matter pursuant to NRS

4.370(1)(g). UJS’s contention concerning the appropriate remedy CCDA should have pursued at best implicates error on the part of the justice court and did not deprive the justice court of jurisdiction pursuant to NRS 4.370. *See Landreth v. Malik*, 127 Nev. 175, 183, 251 P.3d 163, 168 (2011) (“Subject matter jurisdiction is the court’s authority to render a judgment in a particular category of case.” (internal quotation marks omitted)); *see also United States v. Cotton*, 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002) (“[T]he term jurisdiction means . . . the courts statutory or constitutional power to adjudicate the case.” (internal quotation marks omitted)). Therefore, we conclude UJS has not established that we should exercise our discretion to intervene in this matter. *See Pan*, 120 Nev. at 228, 88 P.3d at 844. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.¹


Bulla, C.J.


Gibbons, J.


Westbrook, J.

cc: Hon. Jacob A. Reynolds, District Judge
Kearney, Puzey & Damonte/Las Vegas
The Dean Legal Group, Ltd.
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹In light of this decision, we lift the temporary stay entered by this court on March 6, 2026.