

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CHARLES N. BELSSNER,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
COUNTRY CLUB SHADOWS HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION,  
Respondent.

No. 47487

**FILED**

JUL 14 2006

JAMIE M. BLOOM  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This is a proper person appeal from a district court order that, among other things, denied appellant's petition for exemption from arbitration. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Jackie Glass, Judge.

In this proper person appeal, appellant appears to challenge the June 14, 2006 order entered in Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A517970 that denied appellant's petition for exemption from arbitration. The June 14 order also temporarily stayed that case and Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A520269, until the court could determine whether the cases involved the same causes of action and should be consolidated. The challenged order further directed appellant to appear for a status check regarding the consolidation of these cases and to obtain counsel before the status check hearing.


This court has jurisdiction to consider an appeal only where the appeal is authorized by statute or court rule.<sup>1</sup> No statute or court rule authorizes an appeal from an order denying a petition for exemption from arbitration.<sup>2</sup> Likewise, to the extent that appellant may seek to challenge


<sup>1</sup>Taylor Constr. Co. v. Hilton Hotels, 100 Nev. 207, 678 P.2d 1152 (1984).


<sup>2</sup>See NRAP 3A(b) (listing orders and judgments from which an appeal may be taken).

the temporary stay of the two district court proceedings, the scheduling of the status check hearing, or the direction that appellant obtain counsel, no statute or court rule authorizes an appeal from any of these decisions contained in the challenged order.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the challenged order is not a “final judgment” as appellant contends. A final judgment is one that disposes of all the issues presented in a case, and leaves nothing for future consideration of the court, except for post-judgment issues such as attorney fees and costs.<sup>4</sup> With regard to District Court Case Nos. A517970 and A520269, it appears that these cases have now been consolidated and that both cases remain pending before the district court. Accordingly, as we lack jurisdiction over this appeal we,

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.<sup>5</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Maupin

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Hardesty

<sup>3</sup>See *id.*; KDI Sylvan Pools v. Workman, 107 Nev. 340, 810 P.2d 1217 (1991)(noting that no statute or court rule authorizes an appeal from a district court’s stay order); Brunzell Constr. v. Harrah’s Club, 81 Nev. 414, 419, 404 P.2d 902, 905 (1965) (“An order granting or denying a stay of proceedings is not among [the list of statutorily appealable determinations].”).

<sup>4</sup>Lee v. GNLV Corp., 116 Nev. 424, 996 P.2d 416 (2000).

<sup>5</sup>In light of this order, we deny as moot all motions and requests for relief pending in this appeal, including appellant’s two motions for a stay. Additionally, as we dismiss this appeal, appellant need not file the civil proper person appeal statement as previously directed in the documents mailed to him on June 15, 2006.

cc: Hon. Jackie Glass, District Judge  
Charles N. Belssner  
Santoro, Driggs, Walch, Kearney, Johnson & Thompson  
Clark County Clerk