## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

## MICHAEL W. CRIPPS, Petitioner,

VS.

No. 45990

THE SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WHITE PINE, AND THE HONORABLE JOSEPH S. PAVLIKOWSKI, SENIOR JUDGE, Respondents, and

TAMMY SUE CRIPPS, Real Party in Interest.

FILED

MAY 19 2006 **DEPUTY CLER** 

## ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION

This is a proper person original petition for a writ of prohibition challenging the district court's exercise of jurisdiction in a child support matter. Petitioner contends that he failed to receive notice of a June 2005 hearing, which resulted in an order concerning child support entered on July 8, 2005. Petitioner further contends that his appeal from the July 2005 order divested the district court of jurisdiction over the proceedings. Petitioner therefore argues that the district court lacks jurisdiction to make any further rulings in the underlying case.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

06-10652

This court may issue a writ of prohibition to arrest the proceedings of a district court exercising its judicial functions, when such proceedings are in excess of the jurisdiction of the district court.<sup>1</sup> A petition for a writ of prohibition is addressed to the sound discretion of this court.<sup>2</sup>

We conclude that extraordinary relief is not warranted. First, petitioner's appeal did not divest the district court of jurisdiction over the underlying proceeding. We dismissed petitioner's appeal from the July 2005 order for lack of appellate jurisdiction because the order was not substantively appealable.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the district court retained jurisdiction.<sup>4</sup>

Second, concerning petitioner's claim that he was not given notice of the June 2005 hearing, it appears that the district court vacated the July 2005 order based on lack of notice, and set the matter for a new hearing. We trust that the district court will address and resolve the matter as its calendar permits.

<sup>1</sup>NRS 34.320.

<sup>2</sup>Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991).

<sup>3</sup><u>See Cripps v. Cripps</u>, Docket No. 45725 (Order Dismissing Appeal, November 28, 2005).

<sup>4</sup>See generally <u>Rust v. Clark Cty. School District</u>, 103 Nev. 686, 747 P.2d 1380 (1987) (noting that a premature notice of appeal does not divest the district court or jurisdiction to act).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

2

Accordingly, as appellant has not demonstrated that extraordinary relief is warranted, we deny this petition.<sup>5</sup>

It is so ORDERED.<sup>6</sup>

laup J. Maupin

J.

Gibbons

J. Hardestv

cc: Hon. Joseph S. Pavlikowski, Senior Judge Michael W. Cripps Tammy Sue Cripps White Pine County Clerk

<sup>5</sup>See NRAP 21(b).

<sup>6</sup>While petitioner failed to pay the filing fee required by NRS 2.250(1)(a) and NRAP 21(e), he attached to his petition an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and an affidavit of financial condition. Having reviewed these documents, we conclude that petitioner has demonstrated good cause to waive the filing fee, and therefore, no filing fee is due.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

3