

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JEFFREY JALLO,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
DOUGLAS COUNTY SHERIFF,  
Respondent.

No. 90156-COA

**FILED**

**SEP 24 2025**

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *Melissa Jallo*  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

Jeffrey Jallo appeals from a district court order dismissing his petition for judicial review. Ninth Judicial District Court, Douglas County; Nathan Tod Young, Judge.

Jallo submitted an application for a concealed carry weapon (CCW) permit to the office of respondent Douglas County Sheriff, which the undersheriff denied on September 20, 2024. In the denial letter, the undersheriff stated that, under 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(3), Jallo was ineligible for a CCW permit because he possessed a medical marijuana registry identification card within the one-year period preceding the date of his application.

On February 6, 2025, Jallo petitioned for judicial review of the denial of his application, arguing that § 922(g)(3) did not apply and that he met the eligibility requirements for a CCW permit, which are set forth at NRS 202.3657. Shortly thereafter, the district court entered an order dismissing Jallo's petition, finding it was untimely pursuant to NRS 233B.130(2)(d) because he failed to file it within 30 days of the denial of his

application,<sup>1</sup> and that the court therefore lacked jurisdiction to consider the petition. This appeal followed.

On appeal, Jallo's sole basis for challenging the district court's decision to dismiss his petition for lack of jurisdiction is that the court improperly concluded the petition was untimely because the undersheriff's denial letter did not include a notice of the deadline for filing a petition for judicial review.

This court reviews a district court's determination concerning subject matter jurisdiction de novo. *Ogawa v. Ogawa*, 125 Nev. 660, 667, 221 P.3d 699, 704 (2009). Generally, courts do not have jurisdiction to review official decisions of administrative agencies unless there is a statute allowing it. *Washoe Cnty. v. Otto*, 128 Nev. 424, 431, 282 P.3d 719, 724 (2012). NRS 202.3663 authorizes an applicant for a CCW permit to petition for judicial review of the denial of an application and directs that the proceedings on the petition are to be conducted in accordance with the provisions of NRS Chapter 233B. Among those provisions, NRS 233B.130(2)(d) mandates that a petition for judicial review must "[b]e filed within 30 days after service of the final decision of the agency." And the

---

<sup>1</sup>In finding that Jallo's petition was untimely, the district court incorrectly determined that the time to file his petition for judicial review ran from the date of the denial of his application for a CCW permit rather than the date of service of the denial letter. See NRS 233B.130(2)(d). However, Jallo does not raise that issue on appeal or argue that he filed his petition within 30 days of the date of service. Thus, any argument on that point has been forfeited. See *Powell v. Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co.*, 127 Nev. 156, 161 n.3, 252 P.3d 668, 672 n.3 (2011) (declining to consider arguments not raised on appeal).

Nevada Supreme Court has previously explained that the filing requirements of NRS 233B.130(2) are “mandatory and jurisdictional” and that a “district court lacks jurisdiction to consider a petition that fails to comply with” that statute. *Washoe Cnty.*, 128 Nev. at 432-33, 282 P.3d at 725.

Here, Jallo is correct that the undersheriff’s denial letter did not provide an express notice of the 30-day deadline for Jallo to file a petition for judicial review to challenge the decision. However, such a notice was not required under Chapter 233B of the NRS or the statutes and regulations governing CCW permits.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the denial letter explained that Jallo had a right to file a petition for judicial review under NRS 202.3663 and that the proceedings on such a petition would be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Chapter 233B of the NRS. And a review of NRS Chapter 233B would have revealed the 30-day deadline to file a petition for judicial review. *See* NRS 233B.130(2)(d).

While we recognize that Jallo is not represented by counsel in this matter, “a pro se litigant cannot use his alleged ignorance as a shield to protect him from the consequences of failing to comply with basic procedural requirements.” *Rodriguez v. Fiesta Palms, LLC*, 134 Nev. 654, 659, 428 P.3d 255, 259 (2018). Thus, because Jallo has not demonstrated that the district court erred by dismissing his petition for judicial review for lack of jurisdiction, we necessarily affirm that decision. *See Ogawa*, 125

---

<sup>2</sup>The applicable statutes and regulations are NRS 202.3653–NRS 202.369 and Chapter 202 of the NAC.

Nev. at 667, 221 P.3d at 704; *Washoe Cnty.*, 128 Nev. at 432-33, 282 P.3d at 725.

It is so ORDERED.<sup>3</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Bulla

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Nathan Tod Young, District Judge  
Jeffrey Jallo  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Douglas County District Attorney/Minden  
Douglas County Clerk

---

<sup>3</sup>Insofar as Jallo raises arguments concerning the merits of the denial of his CCW permit, we do not address these arguments given our disposition of this appeal.