IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NEVADA YELLOW CAB CORPORATION: NEVADA CHECKER CAB CORPORATION; AND NEVADA STAR CAB CORPORATION. Petitioners. vs. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA. IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK: AND THE HONORABLE RONALD J. ISRAEL, DISTRICT JUDGE. Respondents, and CHRISTOPHER THOMAS: AND CHRISTOPHER CRAIG. Real Parties in Interest.

No. 68975

FILED

NOV 1 3 2015

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. YOULG
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS BRIEFS AND DIRECTING ANSWER

This original petition for a writ of mandamus challenges a district court order refusing to dismiss taxicab drivers' claims under the Minimum Wage Amendment, Nev. Const. art. 15, § 16, on the ground that the claim is valid only post-*Thomas v. Nevada Yellow Cab Corp.*, 130 Nev., Adv. Op. 52, 327 P.3d 518 (2014). Western Cab Company and Sun Cab, Inc., have moved for leave to file amicus curiae briefs in support of petitioner. Having reviewed the petition and accompanying documentation, as well as the motions, it appears that both the amicus briefs and an answer may assist this court in resolving this matter.

We grant Western Cab's and Sun Cab's motions for leave to file amicus briefs and direct the clerk of this court to file the proposed briefs and appendices, provisionally received in this court on October 23

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(0) 1947A (15 - 345 7 8

and November 6, 2015, respectively. However, because amicus curiae may not raise issues outside of those addressed by the parties, City of Tempe v. Prudential Ins. Co., 510 P.2d 745, 748 (Ariz. 1973); Dempsey v. Allstate Ins. Co., 104 P.3d 483, 490 (Mont. 2004), this court will not consider any issues raised in Western Cab's amicus brief that go beyond those raised in the petition, see also Desert Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc. v. Chrysler Corp., 95 Nev. 640, 643-44, 600 P.2d 1189, 1190-91 (1979) (noting that this court, as a matter of practice, may decline to review constitutional issues not raised below), and the real parties in interest and petitioners are not required to respond to those issues.

Real parties in interest, on behalf of respondents, shall have 30 days from the date of this order within which to file and serve an answer, including authorities, against issuance of the requested writ. Petitioners shall have 15 days from service of the answer to file and serve any reply.

It is so ORDERED.

1 Sarlesty, C.J

cc: Hon. Ronald J. Israel, District Judge
Marc C. Gordon
Tamer B. Botros
Leon Greenberg Professional Corporation
Hejmanowski & McCrea LLC
Littler Mendelson, P.C.
Eighth District Court Clerk