

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

REV. LEONARD JACKSON,
Appellant/Cross-Respondent,
vs.
FAIR MAPS NEVADA PAC,
Respondent/Cross-Appellant,
and
BARBARA K. CEGAVSKE, IN HER
OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS NEVADA
SECRETARY OF STATE,
Respondent.

No. 80563

FILED

JUL 24 2020

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

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal and cross-appeal from a district court order granting declaratory relief in a ballot initiative matter. First Judicial District Court, Carson City; James Todd Russell, Judge.

Reverend Leonard Jackson contends that the district court lacked “jurisdiction” to “rewrite” Fair Maps Nevada PAC’s description of effect. We are not persuaded by Jackson’s argument, as he has presented no authority that actually supports his position, *see Edwards v. Emperor’s Garden Rest.*, 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (requiring parties to support arguments with salient authority), nor has he explained how construing NRS 295.061(3) in such a manner would further any public policy goals, *see Tam v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 131 Nev. 792, 800, 358 P.3d 234, 240 (2015) (recognizing that we construe statutes in accordance with “reason and public policy” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Jackson next contends that Fair Maps’ rewritten description of effect is still misleading. We disagree. While a description of effect must not be deceptive or misleading, *Educ. Initiative PAC v. Comm. to Protect*

Nev. Jobs, 129 Nev. 35, 42, 293 P.3d 874, 879 (2013), Jackson's fixation on the description's use of "could" instead of "will" requires an improperly "hyper-technical" analysis of the description, *id.* at 49, 293 P.3d at 883-84. We are likewise unpersuaded that the district court failed to make sufficient factual findings. The only shortcoming Jackson alleges pertains to an issue that appeared in the original description of effect but that is absent from the amended description. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order insofar as Jackson challenges it.

On cross-appeal, Fair Maps argues that the district court erred in determining that its original description of effect was misleading. In light of our above-mentioned determinations, however, this issue is moot, and we therefore dismiss Fair Maps' cross-appeal. *Personhood Nev. v. Bristol*, 126 Nev. 599, 602, 245 P.3d 572, 574 (2010) ("This court's duty is not to render advisory opinions . . ."). In so doing, we note that Fair Maps has not indicated that it would prefer to proceed with its original petition instead of its amended petition. In light of the foregoing, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.

Pickering, C.J.
Pickering

Gibbons, J.
Gibbons

Hardesty, J.
Hardesty

Parraguirre, J.
Parraguirre

Stiglich, J.
Stiglich

Cadish, J.
Cadish

Silver, J.
Silver

cc: Hon. James Todd Russell, District Judge
Benson Law LLC
Attorney General/Carson City
McDonald Carano LLP/Reno
Carson City Clerk