

*This opinion will be unpublished and  
may not be cited except as provided by  
Minn. Stat. § 480A.08, subd. 3 (2012).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA  
IN COURT OF APPEALS  
A12-1740**

Willie Mae Wilson, et al.,  
Respondents,

vs.

Scott Selmer,  
Appellant,

Raymond A. Jefferson, et al.,  
Respondents,

Susan K. Moore, et al.,  
Defendants.

**Filed March 25, 2013  
Appeal dismissed  
Worke, Judge**

Ramsey County District Court  
File No. 62-CV-12-1213

Thomas C. Kayser, Lars P. Taavola, Matthew R. Veenstra, Michael V. Ciresi, Jennifer G. Daugherty, Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi, L.L.P., Minneapolis, Minnesota (for respondents Willie Mae Wilson and William Wilson)

Neal J. Shapiro, Minneapolis, Minnesota (for respondents Raymond Jefferson, Paul Quast, Terri Mische, Ann Seifert)

Scott E. Selmer, Minneapolis, Minnesota (attorney pro se)

Considered and decided by Worke, Presiding Judge; Kalitowski, Judge; and Schellhas, Judge.

## UNPUBLISHED OPINION

**WORKE**, Judge

Appellant challenges several district court orders, including an order dismissing the underlying action. Because we can provide no effective relief, this appeal is moot, and we therefore dismiss.

### DECISION

Appellant Scott Selmer argues that the district court did not have subject matter jurisdiction over the parties' dispute because respondents Willie Mae Wilson and William Wilson lacked standing to bring the underlying action.

“If, pending an appeal, an event occurs which makes a decision on the merits unnecessary or an award of effective relief impossible, the appeal will be dismissed as moot.” *N. States. Power Co. v. City of Sunfish Lake*, 659 N.W.2d 271, 274 (Minn. App. 2003), (quotation omitted), *review denied* (Minn. June 25, 2003). Here, the question of respondents' standing was raised during hearings on motions for a temporary restraining order and for appointment of a receiver. The district court scheduled an evidentiary hearing to address the question of standing, but before this took place respondents settled the underlying action with the remaining defendants and the action was dismissed, leaving only appellant's counterclaim remaining. The settlement of an action has the effect of a final judgment, but a voluntary settlement can compromise rights in a manner that may not withstand judicial scrutiny. *Id.* (“[W]here the parties to a settlement have equal means of ascertaining what their respective rights were, the courts must uphold any compromise of such rights, although a judicial decision should afterwards be made

showing that these rights were different from what they supposed them to be, or showing that one of them had no rights at all, and so nothing to forego.” (quotation omitted)).

Because there is no ongoing lawsuit, the question of respondents’ standing is moot; this court can offer no effective relief, because the parties have executed a binding settlement agreement and the action has been dismissed. The remaining issue, appellant’s counterclaim, is still before the district court, but respondents’ standing is not relevant to that claim.

**Appeal dismissed.**