

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA


IN THE MATTER OF: E.W.B. DATE OF
BIRTH: 10/12/2011; E.W.B. DATE OF
BIRTH: 11/12/2010; A.W.B. DATE OF
BIRTH: 11/13/2020; A.W.B. DATE OF
BIRTH: 04/30/2022 AND T.B. DATE OF
BIRTH: 03/18/2024

REBECCA W. AND JONATHAN B.,
Appellants,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA; E.W.B.;
E.W.B.; A.W.B.; A.W.B. AND T.B.,
Respondents.

No. 89846

FILED

FEB 07 2025

ELIZABETH A. BRY
CLERK OF APPEALS
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This is a pro se appeal from a district court order, entered in a juvenile court matter, granting Clark County Family Services temporary legal and physical custody of minor children. Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Division, Clark County; Robert Teuton, Judge.

Review of the notice of appeal and documents before this court reveals a jurisdictional defect. This court “may only consider appeals authorized by statute or court rule.” *Brown v. MHC Stagecoach, LLC*, 129 Nev. 343, 345, 301 P.3d 850, 851 (2013). No statute or court rule authorizes an appeal from the aforementioned order. *In re Temporary Custody of Five Minor Children*, 105 Nev. 441, 777 P.2d 901 (1989) (“[O]rders granting

petitions for temporary custody pursuant to NRS Chapter 432B are not substantively appealable.”). Accordingly, we lack jurisdiction and

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.¹

Pickering, J.
Pickering

Cadish, J.
Cadish

Lee, J.
Lee

cc: Hon. Robert Teuton, District Judge, Family Division
Jonathan B.
Rebecca W.
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney/Juvenile Division
Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹Respondent State of Nevada has filed a motion to dismiss this appeal for lack of jurisdiction and appellants have filed a motion for stay. Given the dismissal of this appeal, the motions are denied as moot.

We nevertheless note that it is unclear whether State of Nevada properly served appellants with its motion to dismiss where the certificate of service states that appellants were served by mail “and/or” by email. If appellants were served via email only, service was improper because there is no indication that appellants consented to such service. See NRAP 25(c)(2)(B). Counsel is advised that certificates of service should unambiguously state the manner of service; the use of “and/or” is strongly discouraged.