IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FRANCES M. JONES,
Petitioner,
vs.
THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; THE HONORABLE CARLI LYNN KIERNY, DISTRICT JUDGE; AND THE HONORABLE JERRY A. WIESE, CHIEF JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
MARK JONES,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 88085

FILED
OCT 17 2024
ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order denying a motion to transfer a case to the Family Division of the Eighth Judicial District Court and a district court order denying reconsideration. Petitioner Frances Jones and real party in interest Mark Jones divorced. Thereafter, they reconciled and resumed living together but did not remarry. Several years later, they ended their relationship. When they could not agree on their respective ownership interests in the home where they had been living, Mark brought an action in the Civil Division of the Eighth Judicial District Court seeking to quiet title or partition and apportion the property. The district court denied Frances' motion to transfer the case to the Family Division, and the Chief Judge later denied Frances' motion to reconsider the transfer request.

Frances has failed to provide this court with a written order denying her motion to transfer the case, instead providing a minute order.

24-39257

As a result, we are unable to evaluate the petition. *See Rust v. Clark Cnty. Sch. Dist.*, 103 Nev. 686, 689, 747 P.2d 1380, 1382 (1987) (explaining that a minute order is ineffective for any purpose and that a written order signed and filed by the district court is essential to this court's review); *see also* NRAP 21(a)(4) (stating that it is the petitioner's obligation to provide an appendix that includes all orders and records that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition). While Frances did provide the written order denying reconsideration, the failure to provide the written order from which she sought reconsideration similarly impedes our review of the petition's arguments regarding the reconsideration order.

Finally, we decline Frances' request that we direct the district court to draft an ADKT proposing a local rule to bring motions before the Chief Judge. That request falls outside the scope of relief available through a petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition.[1] *See* NRS 34.160 (providing when issuance of a writ of mandamus is appropriate); NRS 34.340 (providing the forms a writ of prohibition may take). Based upon the foregoing, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

Stiglich, J.
Stiglich

Pickering, J.
Pickering

Parraguirre, J.
Parraguirre

[1]To the extent Mark requested dismissal of this writ petition because the parties have reached a settlement, he has not provided proof of any such settlement. Thus, we cannot grant this request.

cc: Hon. Carli Lynn Kierny, District Judge
Hon. Jerry A. Wiese, Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court
Willick Law Group
Boyack Orme & Anthony
Eighth District Court Clerk