

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF THE  
APPLICATION OF: BRIAN SCOTT  
ROBINSON FOR CHANGE OF NAME.

\_\_\_\_\_  
BRIAN SCOTT ROBINSON,  
Appellant,

No. 83687-COA

**FILED**

**APR 13 2022**

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

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

Brian Scott Robinson appeals from a district court order denying his petition for a name change. First Judicial District Court, Carson City; James E. Wilson, Judge.

Under NRS 41.270, “[a]ny natural person . . . desiring to have his or her name changed may file a verified petition with the clerk of the district court of the district in which the person resides. The petition must be addressed to the court and must state the applicant’s present name, the name which the applicant desires to bear in the future, the reason for desiring the change and whether the applicant has been convicted of a felony . . . .” And “[i]f the applicant has a criminal record, the petition must be accompanied by a complete set of the applicant’s fingerprints.” NRS 41.270.

In the matter below, appellant (who is currently incarcerated) filed a petition for a name change, wherein he indicated that he had been convicted of a felony. However, appellant failed to submit a complete set of fingerprints as required by NRS 41.270, and the district court entered an order denying the petition without prejudice.


Having considered appellant's informal brief and the record before us, we affirm the district court's order denying appellant's petition for a name change. On appeal, appellant admits that the district court appropriately denied his petition based on his failure to submit his fingerprints, but he alleges that the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) will not provide him with a copy of his fingerprints without a court order. Accordingly, Robinson asks this court to issue an order compelling NDOC to provide him with a copy of his fingerprints so he may refile his petition.


Appellant contends he filed motions with the district court related to his allegations that the NDOC has refused to provide him with a copy of those fingerprints. However, those motions are not contained within the district court's docket entries or the record on appeal. *See Cuzze v. Univ. & Cmty. Coll. Sys. of Nev.*, 123 Nev. 598, 603, 172 P.3d 131, 135 (2007) (stating that appellants are responsible for making an adequate appellate record and explaining that appellate courts "generally cannot consider matters not contained in the record on appeal"). Thus, it appears that

appellant did not present this issue to the district court in the first instance, and we therefore decline to address it here. *See Old Aztec Mine, Inc. v. Brown*, 97 Nev. 49, 52, 623 P.2d 981, 983 (1981) (noting that issues not raised in the trial court will not be considered on appeal). Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, we affirm the district court's denial of appellant's petition.

It is so ORDERED.<sup>1</sup>

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup>Nothing in this order shall be construed as prohibiting appellant from refileing his request for a name change in the district court, or to otherwise preclude him from seeking relief related to his allegations regarding the NDOC allegedly interfering with his ability to obtain copies of his fingerprints.

cc: Hon. James E. Wilson, District Judge  
Brian Scott Robinson  
Carson City Clerk