

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PARVIZ SAFARI, AN INDIVIDUAL;
MANDANA ZAHEDI, AN INDIVIDUAL;
AND NOOSHIN ZAHEDI, AN
INDIVIDUAL,

Appellants,

vs.

HAMID MODJTAHED, AN
INDIVIDUAL; AND MOHAMMAD
MOJTAHED, AN INDIVIDUAL,

Respondents.

No. 82279

FILED

APR 20 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This is an appeal from a district court order awarding punitive damages, a purported final judgment, and an order denying a motion for a new trial. Initial review of the notice of appeal and documents before this court reveals a potential jurisdictional defect. It appears that the challenged orders may not be substantively appealable.

Appellants appear to assert in their docketing statement that all three orders are appealable as final judgments. But there cannot be more than one final judgment in a case. *Alper v. Posin*, 77 Nev. 328, 331, 363 P.2d 502, 503 (1961) *overruled on other grounds by Lee v. GNLV Corp.*, 116 Nev. 424, 996 P.2d 416 (2000). Moreover, it does not appear that a final judgment has been entered in this matter because the claims against UT Safety remain pending in the district court. *See Lee v. GNLV Corp.*, 116 Nev. 424, 426, 996 P.2d 416, 417 (2000) (“[A] final judgment is one that disposes of all the issues presented in the case, and leaves nothing for the future consideration of the court, except for post-judgment issues such as attorney’s fees and costs.”). Although a post-judgment order denying a motion for a new trial is appealable under NRAP 3A(b)(2), in the absence of

a final judgment, the order denying a motion for a new trial is not appealable. *See Reno Hilton Resort Corp. v. Verderber*, 121 Nev. 1, 6, 106 P.3d 134, 137 (2005) ("NRAP 3A(b)(2) does not permit an appeal from an order granting or denying a new trial motion addressed to an interlocutory order or judgment.").

Accordingly, appellants shall have 30 days from the date of this order to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. In responding to this order, in addition to points and authorities, appellants should provide this court with a file-stamped copy of any written order finally resolving the claims against UT Safety. Respondents may file any reply within 14 days of service of appellants' response. Failure to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction may result in the dismissal of this appeal.

Briefing of this appeal is suspended pending further order of this court.

It is so ORDERED.

1. J. Sanders, C.J.

cc: The Powell Law Firm
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP/Las Vegas
Wiley Petersen