IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LISA J. GIBSON, Appellant, vs. LAW OFFICE OF MARSHAL S. WILLICK, P.C.; MARSHAL WILLICK, INDIVIDUALLY; AND ROBERT CERCEO, INDIVIDUALLY, Respondents. No. 50142

JAN 1 U 2008 HRACE K. LINDEMAN CLERKOF SUPREMIE COURT BK DEPUTY CLERK

08.00714

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This is a proper person appeal from a district court order dismissing appellant's complaint for failing to post cost bonds. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Timothy C. Williams, Judge.

Appellant's notice of appeal was filed in this court on September 10, 2007. When the notice of appeal was filed, appellant was mailed a civil proper person appeal statement and other documents, as part of the pilot program for proper person civil appeals.¹ As noted in the instructions accompanying the documents mailed to appellant, appellant was required to file her appeal statement within forty days from the date her appeal was filed in this court.² The instructions further explained

²<u>See</u> ADKT No. 385 (Order Establishing Pilot Program in Civil Appeals, June 10, 2005), Exhibit A (Instructions for Civil Litigants Without Attorneys).

SUPREME COURT OF Nevada

¹See ADKT No. 385 (Order Establishing Pilot Program in Civil Appeals, June 10, 2005). <u>See also</u> ADKT No. 385 (Order Extending Pilot Program for Civil Proper Person Appeals, May 10, 2006) (extending the pilot program for civil appeals, which was scheduled to conclude on June 13, 2006, until further order of this court).

that if appellant failed to file the appeal statement by that date, this court would dismiss the appeal.³

Appellant's appeal statement was due on October 22, 2007. To date, appellant has not filed an appeal statement or otherwise responded to this court's directive. Accordingly, we

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.⁴

J. Hardestv J. Parraguirre

J. Douglas

cc: Honorable Timothy C. Williams, District Judge Lisa J. Gibson Selman Breitman, LLP Eighth District Court Clerk

<u>³Id.</u>

⁴Appellant has moved for leave to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis. Respondents oppose the motion. Having considered the motion and opposition, we deny appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Appellant's failure to pay the filing fee therefore constitutes an independent basis for dismissing this appeal. As respondent's opposition to appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis was filed on November 1, 2007, we deny as moot their request for an extension of time to file their opposition.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA