

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF THE PARENTAL
RIGHTS AS TO A.J.B.,

No. 46414

BRYAN EUGENE B.,

Appellant,

vs.

STACY W.,

Respondent.

FILED

FEB 09 2006

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Richard*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This proper person appeal challenges a district court order denying appellant's application for a show cause for contempt order. Second Judicial District Court, Family Court Division, Washoe County; Deborah Schumacher, Judge.

Our review of this appeal reveals a jurisdictional defect. The right to appeal is statutory; where no statute or court rule provides for an appeal, no right to appeal exists.¹ No statute or court rule provides for an appeal from an order denying an application for an order to show cause for

¹See NRAP 3A(b); Taylor Constr. Co. v. Hilton Hotels, 100 Nev. 207, 678 P.2d 1152 (1984).

contempt, arising in a parental rights matter.² Accordingly, we conclude that we lack jurisdiction to consider this appeal, and we

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.³

Douglas, J.
Douglas

Becker, J.
Becker

Parraguirre, J.
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Deborah Schumacher, District Judge, Family Court Division
Bryan Eugene B.
Stacy W.
Washoe District Court Clerk

²See NRAP 3A(b); cf. Pengilly v. Rancho Santa Fe Homeowners, 116 Nev. 646, 649, 5 P.3d 569, 571 (2000); see also Gumm v. Mainor, 118 Nev. 912, 59 P.3d 1220 (2002) (noting that, before an order is considered a special order after final judgment under NRAP 3A(b)(2), it must affect the rights of a party growing out of the final judgment).

³Appellant has filed a transcript request form and, on January 25, 2006, a motion for an extension of time in which to file his proper person civil appeal statement. In light of this order, appellant's requests for transcripts and an extension of time are denied as moot; appellant is no longer required to file the appeal statement.