

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DIRK PATRICK KLINKE,
Appellant,
vs.
TONY CORDA; CONNIE S. BISBEE;
ISIDRO BACA; NEVADA PAROLE
BOARD; AND THE STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,
Respondents.

No. 72877

FILED

MAY 24 2017

CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
BY *Amical*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This pro se appeal appears to be from an order of the district court denying appellant's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. First Judicial District Court, Carson City; James E. Wilson, Judge.

Our review of this appeal reveals a jurisdictional defect. Specifically, no statute or court rule authorizes an appeal from such an order. See NRAP 3A(b) (listing orders and judgments from which an appeal may be taken); NRS 12.015(7) (orders regarding indigency not appealable); see also *Barnes v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, 103 Nev. 679, 81, 748 P.2d 483, 485 (1987). We therefore lack jurisdiction to consider this appeal, and we ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.¹


¹ We note that there appear to be discrepancies in the district court's docket regarding this matter. Although the order denying appellant's request to waive fees and costs is filed stamped April 10, 2017, the docket sheet lists no filings dated April 10, 2017; rather, it identifies the order regarding appellant's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis as having been filed on March 23, 2017. Moreover, although the case appeal


continued on next page . . .

17-17473

It is so ORDERED.


_____, J.
Douglas


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Pickering

cc: Hon. James E. Wilson, District Judge
Dirk Patrick Klinke
Attorney General/Carson City
Carson City Clerk

... continued

statement prepared by the district court clerk notes that appellant's petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition has not been file stamped because the filing fee has not been paid and the request to waive fees was denied, the docket sheet does not reflect the date on which the petition was received by the district court. *See Sullivan v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, 111 Nev. 1367, 1372, 904 P.2d 1039, 1042 (1995) (district court clerk has an "absolute duty . . . to properly receive and keep a record of" documents submitted to the court). Accordingly, we direct the clerk of the district court to review the docket in this matter and to correct any deficiencies therein.