


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MATTHEW TRAVIS HOUSTON,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 84886

FILED


OCT 03 2022

ELIZABETH BROWN  
CLERK OF APPEALS COURT  
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER

On August 26, 2022, this court entered an order that, among other things, directed the district court clerk to transmit any presentence investigation reports (PSIs) to this court. Appellant has now filed “emergency” pro se objections in which he states that he has no issue with the order but explains that he has never participated in a PSI interview or been provided with a PSI.<sup>1</sup> Appellant requests an intervention and an order setting hearing de novo. The motion is denied. Appellant is advised that the August 26, 2022, order directed the transmission of any existing PSIs. If no PSI has been prepared and considered by the district court in the underlying case, no PSI will be transmitted to this court.

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

<sup>1</sup>The objections do not comply with NRAP 27(e), which governs emergency motions, and do not explain why emergency relief is necessary. Accordingly, the objections were handled in the ordinary course.

The objections also lack certificates of service. See NRAP 25(d). This court waives the requirement to file proofs of service in this instance. See NRAP 2. However, appellant is reminded that he is required to provide proof of service for all papers filed in this court. Future failure to comply may result in this court declining to take action on appellant’s filings. See NRAP 25(d)(3).

cc: Matthew Travis Houston  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney  
Attorney General/Las Vegas