

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ADMIRAL'S POINT HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION, A NEVADA NON-  
PROFIT MUTUAL BENEFIT  
CORPORATION; AND LORI GLENN,  
TINA VIRGILI, MARK BRIDGMAN,  
ANTHONY ROMANO, JOHN  
DENNICK, AND IRIS HARBER,  
BOARD MEMBERS OF THE  
ADMIRAL'S POINT HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION, INDIVIDUALLY AND  
ON BEHALF OF THE CLASS  
MEMBERS AT ADMIRAL'S POINT  
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION,  
Appellants,

vs.

VEGAS GENERAL CONSTRUCTION, A  
NEVADA CORPORATION;  
AMERICANA DEVELOPMENT GROUP  
II LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, A  
NEVADA CANCELED LIMITED  
PARTNERSHIP; CONSOLIDATED  
AMERICANA CORPORATION, A  
NEVADA CORPORATION;  
WINDCREST DEVELOPMENT, A  
NEVADA DEFAULTED  
CORPORATION; RICHARD H.  
MCCARTY, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND  
WILLIAM G. GOFF, JR.,

Respondents.

ADMIRAL'S POINT HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION, A NEVADA NON-  
PROFIT MUTUAL BENEFIT  
CORPORATION; AND LORI GLENN,  
TINA VIRGILI, MARK BRIDGMAN,  
ANTHONY ROMANO, JOHN  
DENNICK, AND IRIS HARBER,  
BOARD MEMBERS OF THE  
ADMIRAL'S POINT HOMEOWNERS

No. 39418

FILED

MAR 24 2003

JANETTE M BLOOM  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *J. Richards*  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

No. 39874

ASSOCIATION, INDIVIDUALLY AND  
ON BEHALF OF THE CLASS  
MEMBERS AT ADMIRAL'S POINT  
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION,  
Appellants,

vs.


VEGAS GENERAL CONSTRUCTION, A  
NEVADA CORPORATION;  
AMERICANA DEVELOPMENT GROUP  
II LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, A  
NEVADA CANCELED LIMITED  
PARTNERSHIP; CONSOLIDATED  
AMERICANA CORPORATION, A  
NEVADA CORPORATION;  
WINDCREST DEVELOPMENT, A  
NEVADA DEFAULTED  
CORPORATION; RICHARD H.  
MCCARTY, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND  
WILLIAM G. GOFF, JR.,  
Respondents.


### ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL


Appellants have filed a motion to dismiss these consolidated appeals because the parties have reached a settlement. Appellant's request, however, "that this court retain jurisdiction over these appeals for the purpose of enforcing the settlement agreement." Although respondents join in the motion to dismiss, they oppose the request for this court to retain jurisdiction. Respondents assert that "retention of jurisdiction by this Court post-dismissal would be inappropriate pursuant to the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure." Respondents further assert that "interpretation, jurisdiction and enforcement of the Settlement Agreement . . . should be placed before the District Court as originally requested and stipulated between the parties."

Cause appearing, we grant appellants' motion in part and we dismiss these consolidated appeals. We deny the request for this court to retain jurisdiction. The parties may seek relief in the district court for all issues arising out of the settlement agreement.

It is so ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Agosti

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Rose

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Lee A. Gates, District Judge  
Beckley Singleton, Chtd./Las Vegas  
Burdman & Benson, LLP  
Gonzalez Howard & Reade, Ltd.  
Hutchison & Steffen, Ltd.  
Lincoln, Gustafson & Cercos  
Nitz Walton & Heaton, Ltd.  
Edwards, Hale, Sturman, Atkin & Cushing, Ltd.  
Clark County Clerk