

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ORENTHAL JAMES SIMPSON,
Appellant,
vs.
PAUL DORSEY,
Respondent.

No. 83199

FILED

DEC 06 2021

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

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This is an appeal from district court orders (1) denying respondent's motion for judgment on garnishment, granting respondent's alternative request to conduct discovery, and directing that any issues related to a confidentiality agreement be raised in a different department; (2) granting respondent's motion for alternative relief in aid of execution, denying appellant's counter-motion to continue or quash a writ of execution, and denying appellant's request to require respondent to post a bond, (3) denying appellant's motion to alter or amend and motion for reconsideration and clarification; and (4) denying appellant's motion for relief from judgment.

Initial review of the docketing statement and documents before this court reveals potential jurisdictional defects. It appears that the first three orders are not substantively appealable because no statute or court rule allows appeals from such orders.¹ See *Brown v. MHC Stagecoach, LLC*, 129 Nev. 343, 345, 301 P.3d 850, 851 (2013) (this court "may only consider

¹The fourth order, denying appellant's motion for relief from judgment under NRCP 60(b), is appealable. See *Holiday Inn v. Barnett*, 103 Nev. 60, 63, 732 P.2d 1376, 1379 (1987).

appeals authorized by statute or court rule”); *see also Gumm v. Mainor*, 118 Nev. 912, 59 P.3d 1220 (2002) (recognizing that a post-judgment order must affect rights growing out of the final judgment to be appealable). Appellant asserts in his docketing statement that the orders are appealable pursuant to NRAP 3A(b)(2). NRAP 3A(b)(2) permits appeals from district court orders granting or denying motions for new trial. But none of the challenged orders appear to grant or deny a motion for a new trial.

Accordingly, appellant shall have 30 days from the date of this order to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed in part for lack of jurisdiction. Respondent may file any reply within 14 days of service of appellant’s response. Failure to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction may result in the partial dismissal of this appeal.

The deadlines to file documents in this appeal are suspended pending further order of this court.

It is so ORDERED.

1. Sanderby, C.J.

cc: Malcolm P LaVergne & Associates
Sklar Williams LLP
Mincin Law, PLLC