

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MOHAMAD ABULHAKIM ALHULAIBI,
Appellant,

vs.

AHED SAID SENJAB,
Respondent.

MOHAMAD ABULHAKIM ALHULAIBI,
Appellant,

vs.

AHED SAID SENJAB,
Respondent.

No. 82114

FILED

MAY 06 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

No. 82121

BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER CONSOLIDATING APPEALS AND REINSTATING BRIEFING


These appeals are from the same order entered in separate district court cases. Preliminary review of the docketing statement and the documents submitted to this court pursuant to NRAP 3(g) indicated that the order appealed from may not be substantively appealable; therefore, this court directed appellant to show cause why the appeals should not be dismissed. Appellant has responded in both appeals and argues that the challenged order is collateral to the issues on appeal from the original divorce decision, currently pending in Docket No. 81515, and effectively denies injunctive relief and a modification of custody. Respondent has filed a reply in each appeal and argues that the order appealed from is not substantively appealable.

The district court in both cases below denied appellant's "Ex Parte Petition/Motion for an Order Requiring Production of the Minor Child;" motion for the "Issuance of a Warrant for the Pick-Up of the Minor Child;" motion for an "Order Preventing Abduction of the Minor Child Pursuant to NRS 125D;" motion for a "Return order for the Minor Child to his Home Country of Saudi Arabia;" and respondent's

“Countermotion/Petition for Abduction Prevention Measures; for Orders Prohibiting Removal of Child from Las Vegas, for Court Safeguard of Child’s Passport, for Limited Visitation by a Perpetrator of Domestic Violence, for Stay of Order for Dismissal of Case” and for attorney’s fees and costs. These issues appear to be collateral to the matters on appeal in Docket No. 81515 and constitute both the denial of injunctive relief and a special order after final judgment that affects the substantive rights of the parties rising from the judgment, which is on appeal in Docket No. 81515. *See* NRAP 3A(b)(8); *Gumm v. Mainor*, 118 Nev. 912, 59 P.2d 1220 (2002) (a special order after final judgment is one that affects the rights of a party arising from the final judgment).

Accordingly, these appeals may proceed without prejudice to this court’s right to reconsider the jurisdictional issues as the appeals progress. These appeals are consolidated for all appellate purposes and the briefing schedule is reinstated as follows. Appellant shall have 14 days from the date of this order to file and serve a rough draft transcript request form or certificate that no transcript is requested. NRAP 3E(c). Appellant shall have 40 days from the date of this order to file and serve a single fast track statement and an appendix. Thereafter, briefing shall proceed in accordance with NRAP 3E(d). These consolidated appeals shall be clustered with the appeal in Docket No. 81515 to ensure that the appeals are resolved in a consistent and efficient manner. *See* IOP 2(c)(2).

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

cc: Markman Law
Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.
Willick Law Group