IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FELTON L. MATTHEWS, JR.,

No. 38307

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

FELTON L. MATTHEWS, JR.,

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

FELTON L. MATTHEWS, JR.,

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

FILED

OCT 01 2001

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY

CHEF DEPUTY CLERK

No. 38379

No. 38380

ORDER DISMISSING APPEALS

Docket No. 38307 is a proper person appeal from a decision of the district court to deny appellant's motion for enjoinder for victim to be examined by an expert and request for depositions. Docket No. 38379 is a proper person appeal from a decision of the district court to deny appellant's pretrial petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Docket No. 38380 is a proper person appeal from a decision of the district court to deny appellant's motion for enjoinder of an alleged confession. We elect to consolidate these appeals for disposition.¹

¹See NRAP 3(b).

Our review of these appeals reveals jurisdictional defects. The right to appeal is statutory; where no statute or court rule provides for an appeal, no right to appeal exists.² No statute or court rule provides for an independent appeal from a motion for enjoinder for victim to be examined by an expert and request for depositions, a pretrial petition for a writ of habeas corpus, or a motion for enjoinder of an alleged confession.³ Accordingly, we

ORDER these appeals DISMISSED.²

oung . .

Chall J

cc: Hon. Donald M. Mosley, District Judge Attorney General Clark County District Attorney Felton L. Matthews, Jr. Clark County Clerk

²Castillo v. State, 106 Nev. 349, 792 P.2d 1133 (1990).

³See NRS 177.015 ("The defendant only may appeal from a final judgment or verdict in a criminal case."); NRS 177.045 ("Upon the appeal, any decision of the court in an intermediate order or proceeding, forming a part of the record may be reviewed."); Gary v. Sheriff, 96 Nev. 78, 605 P.2d 212 (1980) (holding that no appeal lies from an order denying a pretrial petition for a writ of habeas corpus).

²We have considered all proper person documents filed or received in these matters, and we conclude that the relief requested is not warranted.