


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MATTHEW TRAVIS HOUSTON,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
AARON D. FORD,  
Respondent.

No. 88280

FILED

APR 23 2024

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL


Appellant submitted a notice of appeal to the district court listing 14 district court case numbers and designating for appeal a January 19, 2024, decision by Judge Schwartz. On March 11, 2024, the district court filed the notice of appeal under each of the 14 district court case numbers, and the notice of appeal was then transmitted to this court in each of those cases. *See* Docket Nos. 88275-88285 & 88312-88315. The notice of appeal filed in Case No. A-23-883015-C was docketed in this court under Docket No. 88280.


Our review of the documents before this court reveals jurisdictional defects. Specifically, NRAP 3(c)(1)(C) requires appellants to designate the order being appealed. But because appellant's notice of appeal lists multiple case numbers, it fails to specifically identify any order and thus is deficient. Further, appellant failed to provide proof of the notice of appeal's service on all parties to the district court cases, which also constitutes grounds for dismissal of the appeal. NRAP 3(d). Although appellant is proceeding in pro se, he is nonetheless required to comply with all applicable court rules and procedures. *See Rodriguez v. Fiesta Palms, LLC*, 134 Nev. 654, 659, 428 P.3d 255, 258-59 (2018) (noting that procedural rules cannot be applied differently to pro se litigants). Accordingly, we


caution appellant that any future notice of appeal must list the specific order in the specific district court case that he wishes to appeal; this court is not required to search through all of his district court cases to determine whether an appealable order has been entered in any of them.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, any future notice of appeal must be accompanied by proof of service per the NRAP 3(d) requirements. Failure to comply with the rules of appellate procedure may result in sanctions, including the dismissal of appellant's appeals and restrictions on his filing privileges in this court.

In this matter, we note that the January 19 order appellant apparently is seeking to appeal was filed in Case No. A-22-853203-W, the appeal from which was docketed in this court under Docket No. 88275.<sup>2</sup> Judge Schwartz did not preside over the proceedings underlying the notice of appeal filed in this case, No. A-23-883015-C, and no decision in that case was entered on January 19. Accordingly, we lack jurisdiction over the appeal in Docket No. 88280 and

ORDER this appeal DISMISSED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Stiglich

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Pickering

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Parraguirre

---

<sup>1</sup>Review of the multiple dockets noted above reveals that, to date, most of the appeals have been dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

<sup>2</sup>Docket No. 88275 was administratively closed because it duplicated an appeal, also challenging the January 19 order, already filed and briefed in Docket No. 87884-COA.

cc: Hon. Nadia Krall, District Judge  
Matthew Travis Houston  
Clark County District Attorney  
Eighth District Court Clerk