

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MICHAEL SARGEANT,
INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF
OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,
Appellant,
vs.
HENDERSON TAXI,
Respondent.

No. 71521

FILED

NOV 17 2016

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This is an appeal from a district court order denying a motion to stay enforcement of the judgment pending appeal.

Our preliminary review of the docketing statement and the documents submitted to this court pursuant to NRAP 3(g) reveals a potential jurisdictional defect. In particular, this court generally has jurisdiction to consider an appeal only when the appeal is authorized by statute or court rule. *Taylor Constr. Co. v. Hilton Hotels Corp.*, 100 Nev. 207, 678 P.2d 1152 (1984). Here, it appears that the order designated in the notice of appeal is not substantively appealable, as there is no such authorization for an order denying a motion for stay. *Brunzell Constr. Co. v. Harrah's Club*, 81 Nev. 414, 404 P.2d 902 (1965).

Accordingly, appellant shall have 30 days from the date of this order within which to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. In responding to this order, appellant should submit documentation that establishes this court's jurisdiction. We caution appellant that failure to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction may result in this court's dismissal of this appeal. The briefing schedule in this appeal shall be suspended pending further order



16-35835

of this court. Respondent may file any reply within 11 days from the date that appellant's response is served.

It is so ORDERED.

C.J.

cc: Leon Greenberg Professional Corporation
Holland & Hart LLP/Las Vegas