

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

AMETHYST PAYNE; IRIS PODESTA-MIRELES; ANTHONY NAPOLITANO; ISAAH PAVIA-CRUZ; VICTORIA WAKED; CHARLES PLOSKI; DARIUSH NAIMI; TABITHA ASARE; SCOTT HOWARD; RALPH WYNCOOP; ELAINA ABING; AND WILLIAM TURNLEY, ON BEHALF OF THEMSELVES AND ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,  
Appellants/Cross-Respondents,

vs.

STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND REHABILITATION (DETR); HEATHER KORBULIC IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY ONLY AS NEVADA DIRECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND REHABILITATION; DENNIS PEREA IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF DETR ; AND KIMBERLY GAA, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY ONLY AS THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION (ESD),  
Respondents/Cross-Appellants.

No. 81582

**FILED**

**AUG 12 2020**

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. Yaukey  
DEPUTY CLERK


*ORDER REGARDING MOTION AND TO SHOW CAUSE*


This is an appeal and cross-appeal from a July 22, 2020, district court order granting in part and denying in part a petition for a writ of mandamus in an unemployment benefits matter. Appellants have filed an emergency motion for immediate relief.

Our review of this motion and the other documents before this court reveals a potential jurisdictional defect. In particular, the district

court's order appears to leave undecided certain issues pending further proceedings, including concerns regarding claimants who were denied benefits because they ostensibly were eligible for benefits under a program different from that for which they applied, which is one of the issues appellants raise on appeal. The court also reserved the right to modify its order as result of those further proceedings. As a result, the appealed order does not finally resolve the matter before the district court. Appeals may be taken from orders granting or denying writ petitions only when the order finally resolves the matter. *City of N. Las Vegas v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 122 Nev. 1197, 1204, 147 P.3d 1109, 1114 (2006); see NRAP 3A(b)(1). Because the district court's order granting in part and denying in part appellant's petition is interlocutory, it appears we lack jurisdiction over this appeal and cross-appeal. Thus, cross-appellants shall have until Monday, August 17, 2020, to file a response to appellants' motion for immediate relief that also addresses this court's jurisdiction. Appellants shall have until Thursday, August 20, 2020, to file and serve a reply addressing both issues. We caution appellants and cross-appellants that failure to demonstrate jurisdiction may result in the dismissal of this appeal and cross-appeal.

It is so ORDERED.

  
Parraguirre

  
Hardesty

  
Cadish

cc: Thierman Buck LLP  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Attorney General/Las Vegas