

1 MICHAEL F. BOHN, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No.: 1641  
2 [mbohn@bohnlawfirm.com](mailto:mbohn@bohnlawfirm.com)  
LAW OFFICES OF  
3 MICHAEL F. BOHN, ESQ., LTD.  
2260 Corporate Circle, Ste. 480  
4 Henderson, Nevada 89074  
(702) 642-3113/ (702) 642-9766 FAX  
5 Attorney for defendants/appellants

Electronically Filed  
Feb 14 2022 04:25 p.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

7 COURT OF APPEALS

9 STATE OF NEVADA

10 NICKEL MINE AVENUE TRUST, a  
Nevada irrevocable trust;  
11 TRAVERTINE LANE TRUST, a  
Nevada irrevocable trust; MAHOGANY  
12 MEADOWS AVENUE TRUST, a  
Nevada irrevocable trust; SATICOY  
13 BAY LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability  
Company,

14 Appellants,

15 vs.

16 COPPER CREEK HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION,

17 Respondent.  
18  
19  
20

No. 82205-COA

**APPELLANTS' ERRATA TO  
SUPPLEMENTAL  
RESPONSE TO  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

21 Nickel Mine Avenue Trust, Travertine Lane Trust, Mahogany Meadows  
22 Avenue Trust, and Saticoy Bay LLC (hereinafter "defendants"), by and through their  
23 attorney, the Law Offices of Michael F. Bohn, Esq., Ltd., submit this errata to the  
24 response filed with this court on February 10, 2022 as follows.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28

1 The Minute Order referenced in the response filed on February 10, 2022 is the  
2 incorrect minute order. The correct minute order dated January 27, 2022 is attached.

3 DATED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of February 2022

4 LAW OFFICES OF  
5 MICHAEL F. BOHN, ESQ., LTD.

6  
7 By: /s/ Michael F. Bohn, Esq./  
8 Michael F. Bohn, Esq.  
9 2260 Corporate Circle, Ste. 480  
10 Henderson, Nevada 89074  
11 Attorney for defendants/appellants

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

17 In accordance with N.R.A.P. 25, I hereby certify that I am an employee of the  
18 Law Offices of Michael F. Bohn, Esq., Ltd., and that on the 14<sup>TH</sup> day of February  
19 2022, a copy of the foregoing ERRATA was served electronically through the  
20 Court's electronic filing system to the following individuals:  
21

22 David M. Bray, Esq.  
23 BRAY LAW GROUP, LLC  
24 1180 N. Town Center Drive, Ste. 100  
25 Las Vegas, NV 89144

26 /s/ Maurice Mazza/  
27 An Employee of the LAW OFFICES OF  
28 MICHAEL F. BOHN, ESQ., LTD.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# REGISTER OF ACTIONS

CASE NO. A-19-791060-C

Copper Creek Homeowners Association, Plaintiff(s) vs. Nickel Mine Avenue Trust, Defendant(s)

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case Type: **Negligence - Other Negligence**  
Date Filed: **03/13/2019**  
Location: **Department 28**  
Cross-Reference Case Number: **A791060**  
Supreme Court No.: **82205**

---

### PARTY INFORMATION

---

<b>Defendant</b>	<b>Mahogany Meadows Avenue Trust</b>	<b>Lead Attorneys</b> <b>Michael F Bohn</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-642-3113(W)
<b>Defendant</b>	<b>Nickel Mine Avenue Trust</b>	<b>Michael F Bohn</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-642-3113(W)
<b>Defendant</b>	<b>Saticoy Bay, LLC</b>	<b>Michael F Bohn</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-642-3113(W)
<b>Defendant</b>	<b>Travertine Lane Trust</b>	<b>Michael F Bohn</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-642-3113(W)
<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Copper Creek Homeowners Association</b>	<b>David M. Bray</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-990-2017(H)

---

### EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT

---

01/27/2022 **Motion** (3:00 AM) (Judicial Officer Israel, Ronald J.)  
*[65] Defendants Motion for Rule 54(b) Determination*

**Minutes**

01/27/2022 3:00 AM

- Defendants filed this Motion for Rule 54(b) Determination on December 21, 2021. Plaintiff filed its Opposition on January 4, 2022, in which Defendants replied on January 20, 2022. NRCP 54(b) governs partially adjudicated litigation as it provides: [w]hen an action presents more than one claim for relief-whether as a claim, counterclaim, crossclaim, or third-party claim-or when multiple parties are involved, the court may direct entry of a final judgment as to one or more, but fewer than all, claims or parties only if the court expressly determines that there is no just reason for delay. Otherwise, any order or other decision, however designated, that adjudicates fewer than all the claims or the rights and liabilities of fewer than all the parties does not end the action as to any of the claims or parties and may be revised at any time before the entry of a judgment adjudicating all the claims and all the parties' rights and liabilities. Here, Defendants argue that Rule 54(b) certification is appropriate because the judgments entered on November 6, 2020 were partially adjudicated and subject to revision since they only adjudicated Plaintiff's breach of contract cause of action, and not Plaintiff's tort-based causes of action. This is not the case. Even though Plaintiff's causes of action were separate, they only stated one single claim for relief for purposes of NRCP 54(b). Hallicrafters Co. v. Moore, 102 Nev. 526, 527 28, 728 P.2d 441, 442 (1986). This is because the causes of action arose out of one single transaction the Settlement Agreement and Release. Id. When adjudicating Plaintiff's Breach of Contract cause of action, this Court determined that Defendants breached the Settlement Agreement and Release. More importantly, it determined that Plaintiff was capped on its damages recoverable from Defendants. In this event, no further consideration was required by the Court as Plaintiff could not seek any further relief from Defendants. Evidently, this Court subsequently granted Plaintiff attorney's fees and costs, in which Defendants raised no objection of the grant being premature. Even more, neither Plaintiff

nor Defendants have made any prior claim that this matter was partially adjudicated or made any attempt to litigate this matter further. As such, it is clear that the judgments intended to be and were a final resolution of all of Plaintiff's causes of action. Thus, certification pursuant to NRCP 54(b) is not amenable and Defendants Motion is DENIED. This ruling is dispositive of the case and as such, the case is CLOSED. This Decision sets forth the Court's intended disposition on the subject but anticipates further Order of the Court to make such disposition effective as an Order. Such Order should set forth a synopsis of the supporting reasons proffered to the Court in briefing. Plaintiff's counsel is to prepare the Order and submit to Chambers for consideration in accordance with EDCR 7.21. CLERK'S NOTE: This Minute Order was electronically served to all registered parties for Odyssey File & Serve. /pc 2/7/22 .

[Return to Register of Actions](#)