


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ENNOBLE BEVERAGES, INC., A  
NEVADA CORPORATION; AND  
CANTERBURY GROUP, LTD.,  
Appellants,  
vs.  
SCOTT MILLS,  
Respondent.

No. 87586

**FILED**

JUN 28 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL*

This is an appeal from a district court judgment in a breach of contract action and from a post-judgment order awarding costs. Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; Tammy Riggs, Judge.

On February 21, 2024, this court entered an order allowing appellants' counsel to withdraw and directing appellants to retain new counsel and cause new counsel to file a notice of appearance by March 22, 2024. No notice of appearance was filed and appellants did not otherwise communicate with this court.<sup>1</sup> On April 22, 2024, this court entered an order directing appellants, by May 6, 2024, to retain new counsel and cause new counsel to file a notice of appearance in this court. If appellants required an extension of time, this court directed appellants to file a motion for an extension of time before expiration of the time to file a notice of appearance. This court cautioned that failure to timely comply could result

---

<sup>1</sup>On May 14, 2024, the copy of this order sent to appellant Canterbury Group, Ltd. was returned to this court by the postal service.

in the dismissal of this appeal. To date, no notice of appearance has been filed and appellants have not otherwise communicated with this court.<sup>2</sup>

Respondent has now filed a motion to dismiss this appeal, contending that the notices of appeal were untimely filed and citing appellants' failure to retain counsel as directed by this court. No opposition to the motion has been filed.

As explained in a previous order, "[a] corporation or other entity may not appear without counsel," NRAP 46A(b)(2); *see also State v. Stu's Bail Bonds*, 115 Nev. 436, 436 n.1, 991 P.2d 469, 470 n.1 (1999) (neither business entities nor trusts may appear or file documents without counsel), or proceed as a pro se appellant on appeal, *Salman v. Newell*, 110 Nev. 1333, 1336, 885 P.2d 607, 608 (1994). Appellants have failed to retain new counsel and cause new counsel to file a notice of appearance in this court despite multiple orders from this court directing them to do so. Accordingly, respondent's motion is granted<sup>3</sup> and this appeal is dismissed.

It is so ORDERED.

Stiglich, J.  
Stiglich

Pickering, J.  
Pickering

Parraguirre, J.  
Parraguirre

<sup>2</sup>On June 21, 2024, the copy of the order sent to Canterbury Group was returned to this court by the postal service.

<sup>3</sup>The motion is granted based solely on appellants' failure to retain new counsel and cause new counsel to file a notice of appearance. This court makes no determination regarding the timeliness of the notices of appeal.

cc: Hon. Tammy Riggs, District Judge  
Eleissa C. Lavelle, Settlement Judge  
Canterbury Group, Ltd.  
Ennoble Beverages, Inc.  
Sylvester & Polednak, Ltd.  
Washoe District Court Clerk