


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

VICTORIA GIAMPA,
Appellant,
vs.
CHARLES F. GIAMPA,
Respondent.

No. 46239

FILED

MAR 28 2006

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL


This is a proper person appeal from a district court order concerning temporary child custody and support. Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Court Division, Clark County; Gloria S. Sanchez, Judge.

Our review of the documents before this court reveals a jurisdictional defect. Specifically, the September 29, 2005 order concerning the child custody and support arrangements ostensibly is not substantively appealable because it does not appear to have finally altered custody or modified support.¹ Instead, the September 2005 order “temporarily” modified the arrangement for custody of the children and reduced respondent’s child support obligation to \$500 total per month. The September order also directed the parties to submit certain evidence to the court and to appear, with the children, before a psychological expert for evaluations and for recommendations as to custody and visitation, in anticipation of a future evidentiary hearing on those issues. Thus, the order does not finally resolve the parties’ various motions and counter motions to modify custody.


¹NRAP 3A(b)(2).

Accordingly, the order is not appealable because it is subject to review and modification by the district court.² Further, although it appears that a hearing was scheduled for January 18, 2006, appellant has not notified this court of any written order finally resolving the custody or any support issues. Once the district court enters a written order resolving these issues, appellant may appeal if she is aggrieved.³ Since we lack jurisdiction, we


ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.

 J.

Maupin

 J.

Gibbons

 J.

Hardesty

cc: Hon. Gloria S. Sanchez, District Judge, Family Court Division
Victoria Giampa
Smith Larsen & Wixom
Clark County Clerk

²See In re Temporary Custody of Five Minors, 105 Nev. 441, 777 P.2d 901 (1989) (holding that no appeal may be taken from a temporary order subject to periodic mandatory review and modification by the court).

³See NRAP 3A(a); NRAP 4(a).