FILED
11/23/2026
ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JOSEPH ANORUO,
Appellant,
vs.
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., A SERVICER FOR HEARTWOOD 2, LLC, AND WILMINGTON SAVINGS FUND SOCIETY,
Respondents.

No. 92140

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a pro se appeal from a post-judgment order denying a motion to aside an order to enforce a lost note.[1] Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Jacqueline M. Bluth, Judge.

Having reviewed appellant Joseph Anoruo's pro se opening brief and the record, we are not persuaded that reversal is warranted. Namely, Anoruo does not coherently dispute that respondents currently possess the original promissory note, such that they are entitled to enforce it. *Cf.* NRS 104.3306 (recognizing that a person who has possession of a promissory note is entitled to enforce that note). Thus, to the extent that Anoruo's appellate brief challenges the district court's November 25, 2025, order, and its January 23, 2026, order, we are not persuaded that the district court abused its discretion in denying NRCP 60(b) or NRCP 59(e) relief. *See Rodriguez v. Fiesta Palms, LLC*, 134 Nev. 654, 656, 428 P.3d 255, 257 (2018) (observing that this court reviews a district court's decision to deny a motion for NRCP 60(b) relief

[1]On April 16, 2026, we entered an order reserving a final determination as to whether we have appellate jurisdiction over this appeal. Having reviewed the record, we conclude that we have jurisdiction to consider the appeal on its merits.

for an abuse of discretion); *AA Primo Builders, LLC v. Washington*, 126 Nev. 578, 589, 245 P.3d 1190, 1197 (2010) (same with respect to an NRCP 59(e) motion). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.[2]

Bell, J.

Stiglich, J.

Cadish, J.

cc: McCarthy & Holthus, LLP/Las Vegas
Wolfe & Wyman LLP/Las Vegas
Dr. Joseph Anoruo
Hon. Jacqueline M. Bluth, District Judge
Eighth District Court Clerk

[2]It appears that Anoruo has other appeals pending before this court pertaining generally to the same underlying dispute, albeit in separate district court cases. Our disposition herein is not intended to have preclusive effect on Anoruo's other appeals. Given this disposition, we deny respondent Wilmington Savings' motion for an extension of time to file an answering brief as moot.