

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANTONIO RODRIGUEZ,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
KATHLEEN ROLDAN-STIEGLER  
F/K/A KATHLEEN RODRIGUEZ,  
Respondent.

No. 57602

**FILED**

**MAY 17 2012**

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *H. Ingelsou*  
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This is a proper person appeal from a district court order concerning child support. Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Court Division, Clark County; Sandra L. Pomrenze, Judge.

On January 19, 2011, appellant filed a notice of appeal from a district court order regarding a November 16, 2010 hearing. The order expressly provided that “[b]ased upon the Court’s ruling on remand, the matter is trailed for counsel and the parties to confer on the calculation of arrearages. Counsel subsequently notified Court staff that they were unable to resolve the issue of arrears as to amount and repayment.” The court further directed that the parties “submit briefs on the issue of arrears.” Respondent has filed a motion to dismiss this appeal, arguing that this court lacks jurisdiction over it because the order appealed from is not a final judgment. Appellant does not oppose the motion.

This court lacks jurisdiction to consider an appeal when it appears that the district court has not entered a final, written judgment adjudicating all the rights and liabilities of all the parties. NRAP 3A(b)(1);

Lee v. GNLV Corp., 116 Nev. 424, 426, 996 P.2d 416, 417 (2000) (noting that a final judgment is one that disposes of all issues presented in the case, and leaves nothing for the future consideration of the district court, except for post-judgment issues such as attorney fees and costs); see also 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 that is subject to modification by the district court). Here, the order that appellant seeks to appeal does not resolve the issue regarding arrears, as the parties were directed by the district court to brief the issue, and thus, the order is not a final, appealable order.<sup>1</sup>

Once the district court enters a written order finally resolving the arrears' issues, any party that is aggrieved from the order may appeal. NRAP 3A(a) (providing that any aggrieved party may appeal from an order); Valley Bank of Nevada v. Ginsburg, 110 Nev. 440, 446, 874 P.2d 729, 734 (1994) (holding that a party is aggrieved within the meaning of NRAP 3A(a) when either a personal right or right of property is adversely

---

<sup>1</sup>Attorney Michael J. Harker, on behalf of appellant, filed a "Request to Allow Lower Court to Determine Child Support Arrears." Attached to the request is an order from the district court filed on May 31, 2011, indicating that the court was inclined to grant appellant's motion for clarification and for reduction, following an evidentiary hearing, of appellant's child support for 2009, 2010, and 2011. Respondent has filed an opposition to this request. Because this court lacks jurisdiction to consider this appeal, we deny as moot appellant's request to remand this matter to the district court for the court to determine arrears. We caution Mr. Harker that, when seeking to represent a party before this court, he must file a formal, written notice of appearance as counsel of record on appeal. NRAP 46(a)(2).

affected by a court ruling). Accordingly, as we lack jurisdiction over this appeal, we

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Douglas

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Parraguirre

cc: Hon. Sandra L. Pomrenze, District Judge, Family Court Division  
Bogges & Harker  
Evans & Rivera-Rogers, Ltd.  
Eighth District Court Clerk