IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MICHAEL WHITFIELD,
Appellant,
vs.
HANNAH GODBEY; CHRISTINA
SENIOR; AND COUNTY OF SANTA
CLARA,
Respondents.

No. 88548-COA

FILED

MAR 2 8 2025

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY DEPUTY OF THE PICTURE OF

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Michael Whitfield appeals from a district court order dismissing a petition for judicial review of a decision entered by a California state court. Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; David A. Hardy, Judge.

Whitfield filed the underlying petition in the Second Judicial District Court seeking to "reverse and vacate" a domestic violence restraining order issued by the Superior Court of California, Santa Clara County. The district court ultimately dismissed the petition, concluding that it lacked jurisdiction "to review a proceeding in another state" under Article 6, Section 6 of the Nevada Constitution. In dismissing the case, the district court determined that Whitfield's challenge to the California court order "must be presented to a California court of competent jurisdiction." Whitfield subsequently sought reconsideration of the dismissal order, but the district court denied that motion. This appeal followed.

On appeal, Whitfield asserts that the district court erred in dismissing his petition because Nevada has jurisdiction over the parties and the underlying issues based on prior child custody proceedings regarding the minor children he shares with respondent Christina Senior and prior

COURT OF APPEALS
OF
NEVADA

(O) 1947B -

25-14275

protection orders he and Senior initiated against one another. He further contends that the California protective order was not supported by substantial evidence and that this order is void as the California court lacked jurisdiction to enter such an order against him.

As the district court recognized, the jurisdiction of Nevada's district courts is established by Article 6, Section 6 of the Nevada Constitution, which provides that district courts "have original jurisdiction in all cases excluded by law from the original jurisdiction of justices' courts. They also have final appellate jurisdiction in cases arising in Justices Courts and such other inferior tribunals as may be established by law." In addition, district courts have the power to issue writs of mandamus, prohibition, injunction, quo warranto, certiorari and habeas corpus. Nev. Const. art. 6, § 6(1).

Here, Whitfield's petition for judicial review expressly sought to have the Nevada district court exercise appellate review to "reverse and vacate" the domestic violence restraining order entered by the Superior Court of California, Santa Clara County. But Article 6, Section 6 of the Nevada Constitution does not provide Nevada district courts with jurisdiction to engage in appellate review of a decision entered by a court of another state, and thus, we discern no error in the district court's dismissal of Whitfield's petition on this basis. See Landreth v. Mailk, 127 Nev. 175, 180-81, 251 P.3d 163, 166-67 (2011) (examining the language of Article 6, Section 6 of the Nevada Constitution to assess a family court's jurisdiction to divide the assets of unmarried parties). As the district court correctly recognized, any request for appellate review of the California court order must be directed to "a California court of competent jurisdiction." And, on appeal, Whitfield fails to offer any cogent argument addressing the district

court's determination that any request for appellate review must be brought in a California court. See Edwards v. Emperor's Garden Rest., 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (explaining that this court need not consider issues that are not supported by cogent argument).

Accordingly, based on the reasoning set forth above, we affirm the district court's dismissal of Whitfield's petition for judicial review.¹

Bulla

J.

Gibbons

J.

Hon. David A. Hardy, District Judge cc: Michael Whitfield Christina Senior County of Santa Clara Hannah Godbey Washoe District Court Clerk

It is so ORDERED.

(O) 1947B **433**

3

¹Insofar as Whitfield raises arguments that are not specifically addressed in this order, we have considered the same and conclude that they do not present a basis for relief.