

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROGER ALDRICH,
Appellant,
vs.
LISA ALDRICH,
Respondent.

No. 53868

FILED

JAN 11 2010

TRACIE A. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from a post-decree district court order concerning child custody and support. Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Court Division, Clark County; Gloria S. Sanchez, Judge.

On appeal, appellant challenges the district court's order awarding respondent temporary physical custody of one of the parties' minor children and ordering appellant to pay respondent child support for that one child.¹ Having considered appellant's civil proper person appeal

¹Regarding appellant's challenge to the district court's March 17, 2009, order awarding temporary physical custody of one of the parties' minor children to respondent, we note that the order states that the custody change is temporary. Accordingly, we conclude that we lack jurisdiction over this portion of appellant's appeal. See NRAP 3A(b)(2) (listing orders that are appealable); In re Temporary Custody of Five Minors, 105 Nev. 441, 777 P.2d 901 (1989) (holding that no appeal may be taken from a temporary order that is subject to modification by the court). Once the district court enters a written order finally resolving the custody issues, appellant may appeal if he is aggrieved. NRAP 3A(b)(2) (authorizing an appeal from an order finally establishing or altering custody of minor children).

To the extent that the custody change is not temporary, as the order fails to set forth a return date for the district court to review the custody decision, we note that the district court's order states that appellant stipulated and agreed to the temporary change in custody. Thus,

continued on next page . . .

statement and the district court record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in ordering appellant to pay child support for the minor child that is temporarily residing with respondent. Wallace v. Wallace, 112 Nev. 1015, 1019, 922 P.2d 541, 543 (1996) (providing that this court reviews district court child support orders for an abuse of discretion). Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.²

Hardesty, J.
Hardesty

Douglas, J.
Douglas

Pickering, J.
Pickering

... continued

appellant is not an aggrieved party and we lack jurisdiction over this portion of appellant's appeal. See NRAP 3A(a); Valley Bank of Nevada v. Ginsburg, 110 Nev. 440, 446, 874 P.2d 729, 734 (1994) (explaining that a party is aggrieved when the district court's order adversely and substantially affects a personal right or right of property); cf. Vinci v. Las Vegas Sands, 115 Nev. 243, 984 P.2d 750 (1999) (providing that when a party stipulates to the entry of an order, that party cannot later attack it as adversely affecting that party's rights).

²Having considered appellant's remaining arguments, we conclude that they lack merit and do not warrant reversal of the district court's orders. Further, in light of this order, we determine that our review of the transcripts requested by appellant is not warranted.

cc: Hon. Gloria S. Sanchez, District Judge, Family Court Division
Roger Aldrich
Lee & Russell
Eighth District Court Clerk