

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DARY GAIL RIEDLINGER AND RUTH
LORETTA RIEDLINGER,
Appellants,
vs.
TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT
CORPORATION,
Respondent.

No. 42162

FILED

OCT 23 2003

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Richard*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This proper person appeal challenges three district court orders: (1) an order to show cause, requiring appellants to demonstrate why they should not be ordered to surrender their vehicle; (2) an order requiring appellants to immediately disclose the vehicle's location; and (3) an order granting an immediate writ of possession, giving respondent the right to immediate possession of the vehicle.¹ Our review of the documents transmitted under NRAP 3(e) reveals a jurisdiction defect. An appeal may be taken only when authorized by a statute or court rule.² In this case, we are aware of no statute or rule authorizing an appeal from

¹We note that appellants' notice of appeal states that they "intend to appeal to the United States District Court of Reno." Nevada Constitution article 6, section 4 explains that this court has appellate jurisdiction "in all civil cases arising in district courts."

²Taylor Constr. Co. v. Hilton Hotels, 100 Nev. 207, 678 P.2d 1152 (1984).

the three orders listed above.³ Consequently, we conclude that we lack jurisdiction over this appeal, and we dismiss it.

It is so ORDERED.

Becker J.
Becker

Shearing J.
Shearing

Gibbons J.
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Jerome Polaha, District Judge
Dary Gail Riedlinger
Ruth Loretta Riedlinger
Kern & Rosenauer, Ltd.
Washoe District Court Clerk

³See NRAP 3A(b)(1)(authorizing an appeal from a final judgment); NRAP 3A(b)(2)(authorizing appeals from certain interlocutory orders).