


IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RONALD TJ ENGLE,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 76929-COA

FILED

OCT 16 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Ronald TJ Engle appeals from a judgment of conviction, entered pursuant to a jury verdict, of four counts of sexual assault on a child under the age of 14, two counts of attempted sexual assault on a child under the age of 14, two counts of lewdness with a minor under the age of 14, unlawful use of a minor in production of pornography or subject of sexual portrayal in a performance, and possession of a visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of person under 16 years of age. Third Judicial District Court, Lyon County; John Schlegelmilch, Judge.

Engle claims the district court erred by denying his motion in limine to exclude the use of the words "nudist" and "nude beach." In his motion, Engle argued the terms were not relevant to the crimes charged, and, even if they were relevant, they were more prejudicial than probative. The district court disagreed and found that these terms were part of the res gestae of the crimes.


Engle failed to provide this court with the transcripts necessary for this court's resolution of this issue. See NRAP 30(b)(1). It is the responsibility of the appealing party to provide these documents on appeal. See NRAP 30(b)(2); *Greene v. State*, 96 Nev. 555, 558, 612 P.2d 686, 688

19-42770

(1980) ("The burden to make a proper appellate record rests on the appellant."). Because Engle failed to provide these documents, we are unable to conclude the district court erred by denying the motion in limine. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of conviction AFFIRMED.¹


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Bulla

cc: Hon. John Schlegelmilch, District Judge
Mouritsen Law
Attorney General/Carson City
Lyon County District Attorney
Third District Court Clerk

¹Engle's "statement of the issues presented for review" included the claim "Whether the district court erred in denying defendant's petition for habeas [sic] corpus." However, this issue does not appear in the rest of Engle's opening brief. Therefore, we conclude Engle failed to support this claim with any relevant legal authority or cogent argument, and we decline to consider this claim on appeal. *See Maresca v. State*, 103 Nev. 669, 673, 748 P.2d 3, 6 (1987) ("It is appellant's responsibility to present relevant authority and cogent argument; issues not so presented need not be addressed [on appeal].").