

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA


ASHLEY MICHAUD,

Appellant,

vs.

NEVADA EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
DIVISION, STATE OF NEVADA;
KRISTINE NELSON, IN HER
CAPACITY AS ADMINISTRATOR OF
THE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
DIVISION; AND J. THOMAS SUSICH,
IN HIS CAPACITY AS CHAIR OF THE
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION
BOARD OF REVIEW,
Respondents.

No. 91503




ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL


This is a pro se appeal from a district court order denying appellant's motion for contempt and order denying appellant's motion "to protect the public." Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Danielle K. Pieper, Judge.


This court's review of the notice of appeal and documents before this court reveals a jurisdictional defect. Specifically, 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 provides for an appeal of the order appellant challenges. the order denying appellant's motion for contempt is not an independently appealable order. Contrary to appellant's assertions, neither order constitutes a final judgment under NRAP 3A(b)(1). *See Lee v. GNLV Corp.*, 116 Nev. 424, 996 P.2d 416 (2000) (defining a final judgment). Nor does either order constitute a special order after final judgment under NRAP 3A(b)(8) as they do not affect the rights incorporated into the final

judgment. *Gumm v. Mainor*, 118 Nev. 912, 914, 59 P.3d 1220, 1221 (2002). “[T]he mere fact that the order in point of time is made after a final judgment has been entered does not render it appealable.” *Id.* at 915, 59 P.3d at 1222 (citing *Wilkinson v. Wilkinson*, 73 Nev. 143, 145, 311 P.2d 735, 736 (1957)).

Accordingly, this court lacks jurisdiction and
ORDERS this appeal DISMISSED.¹


_____, J.
Parraguirre


_____, J.
Bell


_____, J.
Stiglich

cc: Hon. Danielle K. Pieper, District Judge
Ashley Michaud
State of Nevada/DETR - Carson City
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹Appellant’s motion for leave to waive the requirement to attach supporting documents to the docketing statement is granted. The docketing statement was filed on October 23, 2025. Appellant’s motion to file an appendix is denied as moot.