
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA



SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

ORDER DISMISSING APPEALS

Docket No. 77992 is a pro se appeal from an order granting a motion to enforce a settlement agreement. Docket Nos. 78068 and 78202 are pro se appeals from judgments on attorney liens. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Mark R. Denton, Judge.

Review of the documents submitted to this court pursuant to NRAP 3(g) reveals a jurisdictional defect. Specifically, it appears the district court has not yet entered a final judgment resolving all claims of all parties. See NRAP 3A(b)(1). A final judgment is one that finally resolves all claims and issues against all parties to an action and leaves nothing to the district court's consideration except postjudgment issues such as attorney fees and costs. Lee v. GNLV, Corp., 116 Nev. 424, 426, 996 P.2d 416, 417 (2000). There can be only one final judgment in a case. Alper v. Posin, 77 Nev. 328, 363 P.2d 502 (1961), overruled on other grounds by Lee, 116 Nev. at 426, 996 P.2d at 417.

Although the parties reached a settlement, and the district court has entered an order granting respondents' motion to enforce the settlement agreement, the order granting the motion merely directs appellants to comply with the terms of the agreement; it does not resolve the claims raised among the parties or dismiss the complaint. See Brown v. WIC Stagecoach, 129 Nev. 343, 301 P.3d 850 (2013) (an order granting a motion to enforce a settlement agreement is not a final judgment where it does not enter judgment in favor of a party or otherwise resolve the pending claims); Valley Bank of Nevada v. Ginsburg, 110 Nev. 440, 446, 874 P.2d 729, 733 (1994) (concluding that a district court order approving a settlement agreement was interlocutory).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

 $\mathbf{2}$

Accordingly, the judgments on attorney liens are not appealable as final judgments or as special orders after final judgment, and no other statute or rule permits an appeal from such an interlocutory judgment. *Taylor Constr. Co. v. Hilton Hotels*, 100 Nev. 207, 678 P.2d 1152 (1984) (noting that this court has jurisdiction to consider an appeal only when the appeal is authorized by statute or court rule). This court therefore concludes that it lacks jurisdiction, and

ORDERS these appeals DISMISSED.¹

Pickering Pickering

Parraguirre

Cadish

cc: Hon. Mark R. Denton, District Judge Rene Sheridan Gorock, LLC McDonald Carano LLP/Las Vegas Eighth District Court Clerk

¹Appellant's "Motion for Late Filing - Transcript Request Form and Docketing Statement," filed in Docket Nos. 77992 and 78068, is granted. The clerk shall file the docketing statements received on March 5 and 7, 2019, in each docket. The court takes no action on the notice filed on March 18, 2019, in Docket No. 78068. The clerk shall strike the response filed on March 19, 2019, in that docket.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA