

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF THE W.N.
CONNELL AND MARJORIE T.
CONNELL LIVING TRUST, DATED
MAY 18, 1972.

ELEANOR CONNELL HARTMAN
AHERN,

Appellant,

vs.

BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER
SCHRECK, LLP,

Respondent.

No. 72897

FILED

JUN 05 2018

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER

Appellant has filed a letter, in pro se, asserting that her appeal relating to the award of legal fees to Marquis Auerbach Coffing, Docket No. 72766, has been conflated or made a part of her appeal relating to the award of legal fees to Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, Docket No. 72897. Appellant asks that we reconsider reinstating her appeal of the order awarding fees to Marquis Auerbach Coffing.

As explained in our November 22, 2017, order, the notice of appeal in Docket No. 72897 designated Marquis Auerbach Coffing as the respondent and the order challenged on appeal as one filed on March 17, 2017, with notice of entry filed on March 20, 2017. However, the March 17, 2017, order awards fees to Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck. The district court's order adjudicating Marquis Auerbach's attorney's lien was entered on February 9, 2017, with notice of entry served on February 16, 2017. The notice of appeal filed on April 18, 2017, was untimely from the order adjudicating Marquis Auerbach's attorney's lien. *See* NRAP 4(a)(1).

The appeal filed on March 29, 2017, and assigned Docket No. 72766, purported to challenge a February 22, 2017, order awarding attorney fees and costs in favor of Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck. Neither the notice of appeal, nor the challenged order mentioned Marquis Auerbach Coffing. Thus, Docket No. 72766 does not relate to an award of fees to Marquis Auerbach Coffing. Further, the appeal in Docket No. 72766 was dismissed on May 18, 2017, for failure to pay the filing fee. The appeal was not made a part of the appeal in Docket No. 72897.

To the extent appellant asks that we reconsider the dismissal of the appeal in Docket No. 72766, we are unable to do so in the context of a letter. Appellant was required to file a petition for rehearing in accordance with NRAP 40. We note, however, that the time to file a petition for rehearing in that matter has long since expired. See NRAP 40(a)(1) (requiring a petition for rehearing to be filed within 18 days of the filing of the court's decision).

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

cc: Eleanor Connell Hartman Ahern
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP/Las Vegas