

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JO ANN JACKSON,

Appellant,

vs.

JANET RAFAEL, A/K/A JANET JACKSON,
AND WILSON RAFAEL A/K/A WILSON
JACKSON, HUSBAND AND WIFE,

Respondents.

No. 36432

FILED

AUG 02 2000

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


ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This is a proper person appeal from an order denying appellant's motion for summary judgment and imposing sanctions upon appellant for filing several frivolous motions. Our review of the documents transmitted to this court pursuant to NRAP 3(e) reveals jurisdictional defects. Specifically, the notice of appeal is untimely. Notice of entry of the order appealed from was served on February 22, 2000. The notice of appeal was filed on July 7, 2000, well beyond the time limit for filing a notice of appeal. See NRAP 4(a)(1) (providing that a notice of appeal must be filed within thirty days of service of notice of entry of the order appealed from). An untimely notice of appeal fails to vest jurisdiction in this court. See Rust v. Clark Cty. School District, 103 Nev. 686, 747 P.2d 1380 (1987).¹

¹We note that no appeal may be taken from an order denying summary judgment. See State, Dep't of Transp. v. Barys, 113 Nev. 712, 941 P.2d 971 (1997). In addition, no rule or statute provides that an appeal may be taken from an order imposing sanctions. See NRAP 3A(b)(2); Taylor Constr. Co. v. Hilton Hotels, 100 Nev. 207, 678 P.2d 1152 (1984) (providing that this court has jurisdiction to consider an appeal only when the appeal is authorized by statute or court rule). On July 24, 2000, we received appellant's proper person withdrawal of her notice of appeal. In light of this order, no action will be taken on the withdrawal.

Accordingly, as we lack jurisdiction over this appeal, we

ORDER this appeal dismissed.²



Rose J.



Young J.



Leavitt J.

cc: Hon. Gary L. Redmon, District Judge
Law Offices of Robert K. Sparks
Jo Ann Jackson
Clark County Clerk

²Although appellant was not granted leave to file papers in proper person, see NRAP 46(b), we have considered the proper person documents received from appellant. We note that this is the fourth defective notice of appeal filed by appellant within the last several months. This court's resources are not well spent in disposing of appeals over which it clearly lacks jurisdiction. Although we decline to impose sanctions upon appellant at this time, we caution appellant that sanctions may be imposed if appellant continues to file clearly defective notices of appeal. See NRAP 38.