

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LAURA DEMARANVILLE, SURVIVING
SPOUSE OF DANIEL DEMARANVILLE
(DECEASED),

Appellant/Cross-Respondent,

vs.

CANNON COCHRAN MANAGEMENT
SERVICES, INC.,

Respondent,

and

EMPLOYERS INSURANCE COMPANY
OF NEVADA; AND CITY OF RENO,

Respondents/Cross-Appellants,

No. 72737

FILED

JAN 25 2018

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DISMISSING CROSS-APPEAL
AND REINSTATING BRIEFING*

This is an appeal and cross-appeals from a district court order granting in part and denying in part petitions for judicial review. First Judicial District Court, Carson City; James E. Wilson, Judge.

When our initial review of the docketing statements and documents before this court revealed potential jurisdictional defects, we ordered respondents/cross-appellants to show cause why their appeals should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Specifically, it was not clear whether respondents/cross-appellants were aggrieved by the challenged order. See NRAP 3A(a) (allowing an aggrieved party to appeal from an appealable order). Respondents/cross-appellants have filed responses and

appellant/cross-respondent has filed a reply. Having considered these documents we conclude as follows.

Respondent/cross-appellant Employers Insurance Company of Nevada (EICON) is not aggrieved by the challenged district court order because the order does not adversely affect EICON's personal or property rights. *See Valley Bank of Nevada v. Ginsburg*, 110 Nev. 440, 446, 874 P.2d 729, 734 (1994); *Ford v. Showboat Operating Co.*, 110 Nev. 752, 756, 877 P.2d 546, 549 (1994). Accordingly, we dismiss EICON's cross-appeal. EICON may make any arguments in support of affirming the district court order for reasons rejected by the district court in its answering brief. *Ford*, 110 Nev. at 755, 877 P.2d at 548.


It appears that respondent/cross-appellant City of Reno is aggrieved by the district court's order because the order adversely affects the City's personal or property rights. *See Valley Bank*, 110 Nev. at 446, 874 P.2d at 734; *Ford*, 110 Nev. at 756, 877 P.2d at 549. Accordingly, the City of Reno's cross-appeal may proceed.


Briefing is reinstated as follows. Appellant/cross respondent (appellant) shall have 90 days from the date of this order to file and serve the opening brief and appendix. City of Reno shall have 30 days from service of appellant's opening brief to file and serve a combined answering brief on appeal and opening brief on cross-appeal. EICON and respondent Cannon Cochran Management Services shall each have 30 days from service of City of Reno's combined brief to file and serve their answering briefs.¹ Appellant shall have 30 days from service of the latter filed answering brief to file and serve a combined reply brief on appeal and


¹EICON's answering brief shall respond to the opening briefs of both appellant and City of Reno.

answering brief on cross-appeal. Finally, City of Reno shall have 30 days from service of appellant's combined brief to file and serve a reply brief on cross-appeal. The briefs shall comply with the page or type-volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7)(A) except that any combined brief may contain up to 40 pages or 18,500 words. See NRAP 28.1(e). Failure to comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions.

It is so ORDERED.

 J.
Cherry

 J.
Parraguirre

 J.
Stiglich

cc: Hon. James E. Wilson, District Judge
Carolyn Worrell, Settlement Judge
Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers/Carson City
McDonald Carano LLP/Reno
Sertic Law, Ltd.
Carson City Clerk