percent 2010-06 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 8 IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER OF THE ASSIGNMENT OF PROCEEDINGS TO CHANGE THE 10 NAMES OF PERSONS PURSUANT TO NRS 41.270 IN THE 11 **ADMINISTRATIVE** EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT ORDER 2010-06 12 13 ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER REGARDING THE ASSIGNMENT OF PROCEEDINGS TO CHANGE THE NAMES OF PERSONS PURSUANT 14 TO NRS 41.270 IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 15 WHEREAS, the family division of the Eighth Judicial District Court was established 16 in January, 1993. Since that time, petitions for the change of names of adults, and petitions 17 for change of names of minors have been assigned to the family division of the district court 18 19 for management and adjudication. NRS 3.223 provides, in part, that the family court has 20 original, exclusive jurisdiction, in any proceeding: (f) to change the name of a minor. 21 Proceedings to Change Names of Persons is found at NRS 41.270. 22 WHEREAS, the Nevada Supreme Court issued a decision in Landreth v. Malik, 125 23 Nev. Adv. Op. 61 on December 24, 2009. In that decision, the Nevada Supreme Court 24 concluded that NRS 3.223 prescribes the jurisdiction of the family court, and since that case 25 involved a matter not enumerated in NRS 3.223, the family court lacked subject matter 26 27 jurisdiction to enter judgment. NRS Chapter 41 is not listed as part of the jurisdiction of the 28

T. ARTHUR RITCHIE, JR.
DISTRICT JUDGE

FAMILY DIVISION, DEPT. H LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89155

the state of

family division of the district court, and the majority of the Nevada Supreme Court has concluded that the family court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over matters not enumerated in NRS 3.223. While the Nevada Supreme Court in *Landreth v. Malik*, did not hold that seventeen years of orders changing the names of adults are void, in the abundance of caution, and taking the statement in the majority opinion that, "The absence of subject matter jurisdiction renders the family court order void, not merely voidable" at face value, name changes for minors should remain in the family division, and name changes for adults should be reassigned to the civil/ criminal division. This administrative order for the management of these similar civil petitions follows the decisional law.

WHEREAS, the Eighth Judicial District Court Rule 1.30 (b)(5) provides that the chief judge make regular and special assignments of all judges, and hear or reassign emergency matters when a judge is absent or otherwise unavailable.

WHEREAS, the Eighth Judicial District Court Rule 1.30 (b)(18) provides that the chief judge assure that court duties are timely and orderly performed.

WHEREAS, the Eighth Judicial District Court Rule 1.30 (b)(18)(iv) provides, in part, that to facilitate the business of the court, the chief judge may delegate the duties prescribed in these rules to other judges.

WHEREAS, the assignment of the petition for change of names of persons who are not minors to a district judge who serves in the civil/criminal division is necessary in light of the Landreth v. Malik decision.

Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitions for the Proceedings to Change Names of Persons pursuant to NRS 41.270, (non-minors), shall be assigned a civil case number, and assigned to a district judge in the civil/criminal division of the district court.

The Honorable Donald Mosley District Court Department 14 shall be assigned the adult

The Honorable Donald Mosley, District Court, Department 14, shall be assigned the adult name change petitions pursuant to this administrative order for the Eighth Judicial District Court, and matters filed pursuant to NRS 41.270 will be managed by that department at the direction of the civil presiding judge.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the effective date of this assignment is April 5, 2010, and shall continue until modified or rescinded by a subsequent Administrative Order.

DATED this 5 day of Line, 201

CHIEF JUDGE

uhitelud