

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LORI IRISH,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
JAMES H. GORMLEY,  
Respondent.

No. 76458-COA

LORI IRISH,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
JAMES H. GORMLEY,  
Respondent.

No. 76533-COA

**FILED**

DEC 13 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *S. Young*  
DEPUTY CLERK

***ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL, IN PART, AND AFFIRMING IN PART***

Lori Irish appeals from post-divorce decree orders denying a motion for enforcement and awarding attorney fees and costs. Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Court Division, Clark County; Cynthia Dianne Steel, Judge.

Irish and respondent James Gormley obtained a divorce decree and subsequently entered into a stipulation which pertained to the divorce and their then-minor child. As relevant to the instant appeal, Irish subsequently filed a motion seeking to enforce that stipulation and another court order. Gormley opposed the motion and sought attorney fees and costs. Without a hearing on the matter, the district court ultimately denied Irish's motion and granted Gormley attorney fees and costs. Irish then moved for reconsideration, which Gormley opposed. He also again sought attorney fees and costs. The district court denied reconsideration and


awarded additional fees and costs to Gormley without holding a hearing. These consolidated appeals followed.


Our review of the documentation before this court reveals a jurisdictional defect as to part of the appeal. This court has jurisdiction to consider an appeal only when the appeal is authorized by statute or court rule. *Brown v. MHC Stagecoach, LLC*, 129 Nev. 343, 345, 301 P.3d 850, 851 (2013). And no appeal lies from the orders denying the motion for enforcement of a stipulation and a prior court order, and denying reconsideration of that order. NRAP 3A(b)(8); see *Gumm v. Mainor*, 118 Nev. 912, 920, 59 P.3d 1220, 1225 (2002) (providing that an appealable special order after final judgment must affect the rights of some party to the action growing out of the judgment). Therefore, to the extent this appeal challenges those orders, it is dismissed.

As to the awards of attorney fees, on appeal Irish argues that the district abused its discretion in awarding fees because it failed to consider the disparity in income between the parties in making the award since neither Gormley's motions nor affidavits in support of the fees analyzed such issue. See *Miller v. Wilfong*, 121 Nev. 619, 622 119 P.3d 727, 729 (2005) (reviewing an award of attorney fees for an abuse of discretion in a family law matter). But Irish never raised this issue below in her oppositions or motion for reconsideration, either by addressing the disparity of income herself, or by addressing Gormley's failure to analyze the issue or provide evidence regarding his income, and she has therefore waived it. See *Old Aztec Mine, Inc. v. Brown*, 97 Nev. 49, 52, 623 P.2d 981, 983 (1981) ("A point not urged in the trial court . . . is deemed to have been waived and will not be considered on appeal."). Relatedly, she also argues that the award was improper because Gormley did not comply with EDCR 5.506, which

requires the filing of a financial disclosure form. But again, she did not raise this issue below and it is likewise waived. *See Old Aztec*, 97 Nev. at 52, 623 P.2d at 983. And while she summarily raised the issue of whether the district court should have held a hearing on the motions for fees and costs and summarily states that she filed her motions in good faith, she fails to provide any cogent arguments as to these points with regard to the fees and costs awards, and thus we need not consider them.<sup>1</sup> *See Edwards v. Emperor's Garden Rest.*, 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (declining to consider issues that are not supported by cogent argument). We therefore, affirm the district court orders awarding attorney fees and costs.

It is so ORDERED.<sup>2</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Tao

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Bulla

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Irish provided arguments as to why she believed a hearing was required with regard to her enforcement motion and potentially the motion for reconsideration, she failed to provide such argument in regards to Gormley's motions for attorney fees and costs.

<sup>2</sup>Insofar as Irish raises arguments that are not specifically addressed herein, we have considered the same and conclude that they need not be reached given the disposition of this appeal.

cc: Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court  
Presiding Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Division  
Eighth Judicial District Court, Department G  
Lori Irish  
Black & LoBello  
Eighth District Court Clerk