

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN RE THE EXECUTION SEARCH  
WARRANTS FOR:  
12067 OAKLAND HILLS, LAS VEGAS,  
NEVADA 89141; 54 CAROLINA  
CHERRY DRIVE, LAS VEGAS,  
NEVADA 89141; 5608 QUIET CLOUD  
DRIVE, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89141  
AND 3321 ALCUDIA BAY AVENUE,  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89141.

No. 71536

**FILED**

MAR 24 2017

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY: *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY CLERK

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
DEPARTMENT,

Appellant,

vs.

LAURA ANDERSON,

Respondent.

*ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE*

This is an appeal from a district court order granting a motion for attorney fees. Our initial review of the docketing statement and documents before this court reveals a potential jurisdictional defect. The order appealed from appears interlocutory, and no statute or court rule authorizes an appeal from an interlocutory order awarding attorney fees. *See* NRAP 3A(b); *Taylor Constr. Co. v. Hilton Hotels Corp.*, 100 Nev. 207, 209, 678 P.2d 1152, 1153 (1984). Although an appeal from a post-judgment order awarding attorney fees is available under NRAP 3A(b)(8) as a special order after final judgment, it appears that, here, the district court has not entered a final, written judgment resolving respondent's motion for return of property. The district court signed an order granting the motion on April 20, 2016, and notice of entry of the order was filed and

served on April 26, 2016. However, it does not appear that the order was ever filed in the district court—the order does not appear on the district court docket sheet and the copy of the order attached to the notice of entry of order does not bear the file-stamp of the district court clerk. *See Rust v. Clark Cty. Sch. Dist.*, 103 Nev. 686, 689, 747 P.2d 1380, 1382 (1987) (an unfiled written order is ineffective for any purpose). It thus appears that the challenged order granting a motion for attorney fees is not appealable as a special order after final judgment.

Accordingly, appellant shall have 30 days from the date of this order to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Respondent may file any reply within 11 days from the date that appellant's response is served. We caution appellant that failure to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction may result in the dismissal of this appeal.

Briefing of this appeal is suspended pending further order of this court.

It is so ORDERED.

Cherry, C.J.

cc: Marquis Aurbach Coffing  
Kathleen Bliss Law PLLC