

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE  
OF NEVADA; THE STATE OF NEVADA  
DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION; AND  
THE STATE OF NEVADA  
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES,

Appellants/Cross-Respondents,

vs.

THE HONORABLE JAMES A.  
SETTELMAYER; THE HONORABLE  
JOE HARDY; THE HONORABLE  
HEIDI SEEVERS GANSERT; THE  
HONORABLE SCOTT T. HAMMOND;  
THE HONORABLE PETE  
GOICOECHEA; THE HONORABLE  
BEN KIECKHEFER; THE  
HONORABLE IRA D. HANSEN; THE  
HONORABLE KEITH F. PICKARD, IN  
THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITIES AS  
MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OF THE  
STATE OF NEVADA AND  
INDIVIDUALLY; GREAT BASIN  
ENGINEERING CONTRACTORS, LLC,  
A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY; GOODFELLOW  
CORPORATION, A UTAH  
CORPORATION QUALIFIED TO DO  
BUSINESS IN THE STATE OF  
NEVADA; KIMMIE CANDY COMPANY,  
A NEVADA CORPORATION;  
KEYSTONE CORP., A NEVADA  
NONPROFIT CORPORATION;  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF  
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, A  
CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT  
CORPORATION QUALIFIED TO DO  
BUSINESS IN THE STATE OF  
NEVADA; NEVADA FRANCHISED  
AUTO DEALERS ASSOCIATION, A

No. 81924

FILED

DEC 07 2020

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

NEVADA NONPROFIT  
CORPORATION; NEVADA TRUCKING  
ASSOCIATION, INC., A NEVADA  
NONPROFIT CORPORATION; AND  
RETAIL ASSOCIATION OF NEVADA, A  
NEVADA NONPROFIT  
CORPORATION,  
Respondents/Cross-Appellants.

### ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This is an appeal and cross-appeal from a district court order declaring SB 542 and SB 551 to be unconstitutional. Initial review of respondents/cross-appellants' notice of appeal reveals a potential jurisdictional defect. It appears that respondents/cross-appellants are not aggrieved by the challenged judgment. Only a party aggrieved by a judgment may appeal. NRAP 3A(a). "A party who prevails in the district court and who does not wish to alter any rights of the parties arising from the judgment is not aggrieved by the judgment." *Ford v. Showboat Operating Co.*, 110 Nev. 752, 756, 877 P.2d 546, 549 (1994). Here, the district court found in favor of the claims submitted by respondents/cross-appellants complaint. Thus, respondents/cross-appellants prevailed in the district court. Respondents/cross-appellants appear to challenge the district courts conclusion regarding whether individuals were necessary or proper parties entitled to legislative immunity. But no appeal may be taken from the district court's conclusions of law. *Id.*

Accordingly, respondents/cross-appellants shall have 30 days from the date of this order to show cause why the cross-appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Appellants/cross-respondents may file any reply within 14 days of respondents/cross-appellants' response. Failure

to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction may result in the dismissal of the cross-appeal.

The deadlines to file documents in this matter are suspended pending further order of this court.

It is so ORDERED.

Pickering, C.J.

cc: Attorney General/Carson City  
Legislative Counsel Bureau Legal Division  
Allison MacKenzie, Ltd.