

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JENNIFER ISSO, ESQ.,
Appellant,
vs.
HENRY E. GAAR,
Respondent.

No. 84621

FILED

JUN 23 2022

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This is an appeal from a district court order affirming and adopting the findings of the discovery commissioner regarding issues arising during the discovery process.

Initial review of the docketing statement and documents before this court reveals potential jurisdictional defects. First, NRAP 3A(a) allows an appeal from an aggrieved party. Appellant, as counsel for defendant below is not a party to the district court action, and thus appears to lack standing to bring the instant appeal. *See Albert D. Massi, Ltd. v. Bellmyre*, 111 Nev. 1520, 1521, 908 P.2d 705, 706 (1995) (recognizing that “an attorney representing a client in a case is not a party to the action and does not have standing to appeal”); *Albany v. Arcata Assocs., Inc.*, 106 Nev. 688, 799 P.2d 566 (1990) (attorney for defendants could not appeal order of sanctions because he was not a party to the action).

Second, it does not appear that the challenged order is substantively appealable. In her docketing statement, appellant states that the order is appealable as a final judgment under NRAP 3A(b)(1). “[A] final judgment is one that disposes of all the issues presented in the case, and leaves nothing for the future consideration of the court, except for post-

judgment issues such as attorney's fees and costs." *Lee v. GNLV Corp.*, 116 Nev. 424, 426, 996 P.2d 416, 417 (2000). The challenged order does not appear to dispose of any issues presented in the underlying custody dispute, and no other statute or court rule appears to allow for an appeal. See *Brown v. MHC Stagecoach, LLC*, 129 Nev. 343, 345, 301 P.3d 850, 851 (2013) (This court "may only consider appeals authorized by statute or court rule.").

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 14 days of service of appellant's response. Failure to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction may result in the dismissal of this appeal for lack of jurisdiction. The deadlines for filing documents in this appeal are suspended pending further order of this court.

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

cc: Isso & Hughes Law Firm
Jacobson Law Office, Ltd.