

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DAVID KEVIN GRENKA,
Appellant,
vs.
MARIE GRENKA,
Respondent.

No. 69700

FILED

MAY 06 2016

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is an appeal from a district court's amended decree of divorce. Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Court Division, Clark County; Rebecca Burton, Judge.

After the district court entered an amended divorce decree dividing the parties' assets and awarding respondent spousal support, appellant filed this appeal. On appeal, appellant first asserts that the district court abused its discretion by delaying the trial on numerous occasions. *See Hopper v. Hopper*, 79 Nev. 86, 88, 378 P.2d 875, 876 (1963) (recognizing that it is within the district court's discretion as to whether to continue a trial date). Having reviewed the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in delaying the trial date as both parties were unwilling or unable to produce relevant documents and information in a timely manner and because other factors outside of the parties' control contributed to the delays. *See id.* Thus, the delay of trial does not warrant a reversal of the district court's order.


The only other arguments appellant presents on appeal are that the amended divorce decree did not fix all the errors in the award of spousal support, that the district court did not differentiate between the division of pretax assets and other assets, that the amended decree

contained mathematical errors, and that the court was biased against appellant. But aside from generally noting these issues, appellant does nothing to specify what alleged errors in the spousal support award the district court purportedly failed to correct, what assets were wrongfully classified or divided and why the treatment of those assets was improper, what computations were erroneous, or what actions the court took against appellant that he believes demonstrated bias. Without fully developed cogent arguments as to these points, we are unable to examine these issues and therefore we decline to address them. *See Edwards v. Emperor's Garden Rest.*, 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (providing that an appellate court need not consider claims that are not cogently argued).

Accordingly, because appellant has failed to articulate any grounds which would warrant reversal of the district court's amended divorce decree, we necessarily

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Silver

cc: Hon. Rebecca Burton, District Judge, Family Court Division
David Kevin Grenka
Hanratty Law Group
Eighth District Court Clerk