

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC, A
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY,
Appellant,
vs.
U.S. BANK, N.A., A NATIONAL
BANKING ASSOCIATION AS
TRUSTEE FOR THE CERTIFICATE
HOLDERS OF WELLS FARGO ASSET
SECURITIES CORPORATION,
MORTGAGE PASS-THROUGH
CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2006-AR4;
AND LUCIA PARKS, AN INDIVIDUAL,
Respondents.

No. 63614

FILED

SEP 17 2013

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY R. Malone
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This is an appeal from a district court order denying a preliminary injunction and from a district court order granting a motion to dismiss. Our preliminary review of the docketing statement and the documents submitted to this court pursuant to NRAP 3(g) reveals a potential jurisdictional defect. Specifically, the notice of appeal appears to have been filed after an NRAP 4(a)(4) tolling motion was filed on June 26, 2013, but before that tolling motion was resolved, thus rendering the notice of appeal premature as to the dismissal order. See NRAP 4(a)(6). It further appears that no formal, written order resolving the tolling motion has been entered.

Accordingly, appellant shall have 15 days from the date of this order within which to show cause why this appeal should not be

dismissed, in part,¹ for lack of jurisdiction. In responding to this order, appellant should submit documentation that establishes this court's jurisdiction including, but not necessarily limited to, a copy of any written district court order resolving the tolling motion. We caution appellant that failure to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction may result in this court's partial dismissal of this appeal. The briefing schedule in this appeal shall be suspended pending further order of this court. Respondents may file any reply within 11 days from the date that appellant's response is served.

It is so ORDERED.

Pickering, C.J.

cc: Howard Kim & Associates
Wright, Finlay & Zak, LLP/Las Vegas
Albright, Stoddard, Warnick & Albright

¹We note that, regardless of whether appellant demonstrates that this court has jurisdiction to review the June 11, 2013, dismissal order, this court has jurisdiction to consider appellant's appeal from the June 10, 2013, order denying preliminary injunctive relief.