

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MICHAEL J. MONA, JR., AN
INDIVIDUAL; AND RHONDA H.
MONA, NON-PARTY,

Appellants,

vs.

FAR WEST INDUSTRIES, A
CALIFORNIA CORPORATION,
Respondent.

No. 70857

FILED

MAR 23 2017

ELIZABETH H. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This is an appeal from an amended nunc pro tunc district court order granting in part a motion to reduce sanctions to judgment. Our initial review of the docketing statement and documents before this court reveals potential jurisdictional defects. First, as acknowledged by appellants, it appears that appellant Rhonda H. Mona, individually, was not a party to the district court proceedings and thus lacks standing to appeal the challenged order. *See* NRAP 3A(a) (allowing an appeal by an aggrieved party); *Mona v. Eighth Jud. District Court*, 132 Nev. Adv. Op. 72, 380 P.3d 836 (2016) (explaining the difference between Rhonda in her capacities as an individual and as co-trustee of the Mona Family Trust and stating that, in her individual capacity, Rhonda “is a third party to the underlying action”).

Second, it appears that appellant Michael J. Mona is not aggrieved by the challenged order and lacks standing to appeal because the order only allows respondent to execute against Rhonda Mona. *See* NRAP 3A(a); *Valley Bank v. Ginsburg*, 110 Nev. 440, 446, 874 P.2d 729, 734 (1994) (a party is aggrieved under NRAP 3A(a) if a right of property or

17-09775

personal right is substantially and adversely affected by the ruling of the district court).

Third, it appears that this appeal may be moot. Appellants state in their docketing statement that resolution of the writ petition in Docket No. 68434 will most likely render this appeal moot. This court resolved the petition in Docket No. 68434 on September 29, 2016. Further, the dispositional order in that case addressed most of the issues appellants state will be raised in this appeal.

Accordingly, appellants shall have 30 days from the date of this order to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. We caution appellants that failure to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction may result in the dismissal of this appeal. Respondent may file any reply within 11 days from service of appellants' response.

The deadlines to request transcripts and file briefs are suspended pending further order of this court.

It is so ORDERED.

Cherry, C.J.

cc: Santoro Whitmire
Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg
Marquis Aurbach Coffing
Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine Wray Puzey & Thompson/Las Vegas