

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MICHAEL A. CARRIGAN, FOURTH
WARD CITY COUNCIL MEMBER, OF
THE CITY OF SPARKS,
Appellant,

vs.

THE COMMISSION ON ETHICS OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 51920

FILED

JUL 22 2008

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER SETTING EXPEDITED BRIEFING SCHEDULE


This appeal challenges a district court order denying a petition for judicial review of a Nevada Ethics Commission decision, which provided that appellant should have recused himself from voting on a city council matter under former NRS 281.501(8)(d) (“substantial and continuing business relationship”) and (e) (“substantially similar” type of relationship).¹

Appellant has filed a motion seeking to expedite this appeal, asserting that expeditious treatment is warranted because NRS 281.501(8)(d) and (e) are unconstitutionally vague and the district court and Ethics Commission decisions constitute an unlawful prior restraint on protected political speech. In the motion, appellant indicates that this appeal raises issues of constitutional importance and widespread effect. Appellant also points out that, as a practical matter, an expedited briefing schedule in this appeal should not unduly hinder the parties, since the issues were already briefed below. The motion is unopposed.

¹NRS 281.501 was recodified at NRS 281A.420 in 2007.

Having considered appellant's arguments, we conclude that an expedited briefing schedule is appropriate, and therefore, we grant appellant's motion. Appellant shall have 30 days from the date of this order to file and serve the opening brief and appendix. Thereafter, briefing shall proceed in accordance with NRAP 31(a)(1). Upon the completion of briefing, we will expedite our resolution of this appeal as the court's docket permits.

It is so ORDERED.

, V.C.J.

cc: Hon. William A. Maddox, District Judge
Sparks City Attorney
Nevada Commission on Ethics
Carson City Clerk