



Minutes

Advisory Committee Meeting

Standing Committee on Appellate Disposition Classification

February 23, 2026

1:00 p.m.

Zoom

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Alex Falconi at 1:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present:

Alex Falconi, Founding Director

The Hon. Bitia Yeager, Member

The Hon. Kriston Hill, Member

The Hon. Anna Albertson, Member

Vikki Seelig, Secretary

Absent:

The Hon. Joe Hardy, Chair

The Hon. Tammy Riggs, Member

Discussion:

Alex Falconi mentioned Joe Hardy was in a hearing.

3. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting

Approved without objection.

4. Discussion

The Committee's instructions included questions. Addendum 1. All questions were resolved.

Question 2

Discussion: The Committee reviewed Supreme Court docket no. 87468 and advised that the remand in question was procedural and a non-error. [UIOP&P 103\(b\)\(7\)\(i\)](#). A new disposition category will be proposed to the Board and applied retroactively to similar vacatur as appropriate.

Question 3

Discussion: The Committee reviewed Supreme Court docket no. 88462 and advised it does not constitute error because the corrected sentence, if uncorrected, would not have caused the prisoner to suffer any additional incarceration. [UIOP&P 103\(b\)\(7\)\(i\)](#).

Question 4

Discussion: The Committee reviewed Supreme Court docket no. 86673 and advised it does not constitute error within the context of the appealed decision because vacatur occurred on issues jurisdiction was divested of. [UIOP&P 103](#).

Question 5

Discussion: The Committee advised that short-trial judge decisions are signed by the judge of the department and that per the Nevada Short Trial Rules the judge lacks any authority to alter or reject the



Minutes

Advisory Committee Meeting

proposed order. This is in contrast to recommendations issued by hearing commissioners, which a judge has the duty and obligation to reject or alter if inconsistent with the law, relevant rules of which include a procedure for objecting to recommendations. A policy change will be proposed to the Board and applied retroactively to all short trial dispositions.

Question 8

Discussion: The Committee advised that certain compound dispositions over the same issue penalize the same judge with a heavier weight simply because multiple parties appeal. [UIOP&P 103\(e\) and \(f\)](#). A policy change will be proposed to the Board on how to handle compound dispositions. The issue is sensitive because it would retroactively apply to correct and erroneous dispositions both.

Action Items

Alex Falconi will present the committee's advice to the Board for consideration of policy changes.

5. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by Alex Falconi.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting is to be scheduled when necessary and appropriate.

July 16, 2026

/s/ Vikki Seelig
Vikki Seelig
Secretary

ADDENDUM 1

ADDENDUM 1

The Advisory Committee on Appellate Disposition Classification

February 19, 2026

A vote was advanced to January 17, 2025. The committee was instituted by [Directive 2025-0004](#). The committee is recognized as having very busy members and is encouraged to participate as efficiently as possible.

This committee is tasked with:

- 1) Answering questions that broadly assist with policy decisions on how the corporation classifies appellate dispositions. These changes are important because they trigger retroactive, categorical reclassification of existing cases which could affect all judicial profiles on the website.
- 2) Answering questions that assist with classification of a specific appellate disposition.
- 3) Answering questions that assist with published reports that involve appellate dispositions, especially those including statistical analysis.

The advice the committee renders is not binding, rendering the reasoning more valuable than any conclusion. A conclusion is persuasive, but the reasoning will ultimately control a policy or classification decision. The committee is asked to answer questions 1 through 7.

Question 1: Publication of Report Zero

Answered. December 3, 2025 Minutes.

Question 2: New Disposition Type, Affirmed and Vacated

In Supreme Court docket no. 87468, District Court Judge Tammy Riggs's decision was affirmed, vacated, and remanded. The questions posed are 1) does the vacatur and remand suggest error; 2) more specifically, was the appellant vindicated such that he gleaned real benefit. It appears responses to this question could result in a new disposition type, the new category of which could pull dispositions from other judicial profiles and trigger retroactive modification of error rates. The members should take note in their responses as their reasoning would assist with how this broad category is defined.



The Advisory Committee on Appellate Disposition Classification

February 19, 2026

Question 3:

In Supreme Court docket no. 88462, District Court Judge Kathleen Sigurdson's decision was affirmed with limited remand. It appears the appellant was vindicated such that he garnered a real benefit that he would not have garnered had the appeal not occurred. The question posed is: 1) would the appellant have suffered additional incarceration had this disposition not occurred; and, 2) if not, is there any other actual benefit the appellant garnered from the disposition?

Question 4: Vacatur Unrelated to Disposition

In Supreme Court case no. 86673, District Court Judge Dawn Throne's decision was affirmed with an order not subject to appeal apparently having been vacated. It appears vacatur occurred because jurisdiction was divested on appeal. The questions posed are: 1) is an order rendered while jurisdiction is divested void or voidable; and, 2) should existing policy be clarified to provide that an order vacated under these circumstances does not count as error because it was not an issue directly on appeal?

Question 5: Disposition from Short-Trial Judgment or Verdict

It has been suggested that appeals from short trials should be applied to the short-trial judge and not the District Court Judge presiding over the department. Existing policy imputes the error of a hearing master or discovery commissioner to the District Court Judge because the former only issue recommendations for orders and the legal process provides that a District Court Judge always review and approve the recommendation. UIOP&P 103(i). If no similar review occurs when the verdict or judgment of a short-trial judge, policy should be altered to account for this distinction. The question posed is: under what circumstances, if any, is a short-trial judge's ruling subjected to the review of the presiding District Court Judge.

Question 6: Distinguishing Criminal and Civil Appellate Dispositions

Answered. December 3, 2025 Minutes.



The Advisory Committee on Appellate Disposition Classification

February 19, 2026

Question 7: Weighing Appellate Disposition by Vote

Answered. December 3, 2025 Minutes.

Question 8: Split & Compound Dispositions Revisited

A split disposition is one which contains a mixture of affirmed and reversed issues. Existing policy treats a partially reversed disposition as any other reversal, regardless of how much was affirmed or dismissed.

A compound disposition is an appellate court's clustering of multiple cases. Existing policy applies dispositions to a judicial profile based on appellate case number, so compound dispositions weigh more heavily if affirmed or reversed. Also, unlike split dispositions, there are occasions where a disposition affirmed in part and reversed in part can be distributed accordingly depending on which cases within the compound disposition are affirmed or reversed.

The committee is invited to revisit these policies.