IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FRANCHISE TAX BOARD OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Appellant/Cross-Respondent,

Respondent/Cross-Appellant.

VS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

GILBERT P. HYATT,

No. 53264

Electronically Filed Aug 06 2009 03:30 p.m. Tracie K. Lindeman

OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT GILBERT P. HYATT'S (1) OPPOSITION TO MOTION BY <u>MULTISTATE TAX COMMISSION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF; (2)</u> <u>MOTION TO STRIKE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF THE STATE OF UTAH; (3) MOTION TO</u> STRIKE NOTICE OF CONCURRENCE

This opposition is filed by and for CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO, ATTORNEY GENERAL, through her SOLICITOR GENERAL, C. WAYNE HOWLE, in response to the multi-faceted brief filed by RESPONDENT ROBERT HYATT, dated July 28, 2009.

Respondent's legal brief requests three items of relief from the Court: (1) that the Multistate Tax Commission's (MTC's) amicus brief be disallowed; (2) that the joint brief of seventeen states be stricken; and (3) that the Notice of Concurrence filed by the Attorney General be stricken.

Regarding the first two matters, the Nevada Attorney General concurs in the briefs filed
by the States and the MTC. With regard to the third, the following additional points are made
for the Court's consideration.

23

1.

18

19

ATTORNEY GENERAL INVOLVEMENT IS APPROPRIATE.

Footnote 1 of Hyatt's brief suggests that there is something unusual in the role the State Attorney General takes by helping to bring forward the states' and MTC's amicus briefs. To the contrary, the Attorney General's involvement is entirely proper. Standing as local counsel for MTC and the states is in service to the State of Nevada. The Attorney General is well positioned to appreciate the potential effects this matter can have on the State. On a

daily basis she defends the State and its officers in civil litigation. Her duties include
asserting, when appropriate, the immunities of the State.¹ As the official attorney, the
Attorney General must articulate the limitations on the legislature's waiver of immunities, as
set out in NRS 41.031 (no waiver of Eleventh Amendment protection), NRS 41.035(1)
(punitive awards against State prohibited; tort awards capped at \$75,000), and elsewhere.

The views and interests of the MTC as well as the other states are congruent with Nevada's interest. A rule of liability, jurisdiction, or comity established in this case can affect every state. The fact that seventeen other states have expressed an interest in the present case speaks for itself to the seriousness of the issues.

Additionally, by serving as local counsel for the MTC and the various states, the Attorney General is not engaged in the private practice of law. Although not defined in chapter 228, elsewhere the term "private practice of law" is defined to mean "the performance of legal service, for compensation, for any person or organization except [the district attorney's] county and any other governmental agency which he has a statutory duty to serve." NRS 245.0435. There is no allegation here that the MTC is paying compensation for services, and in fact it is not. Therefore the Attorney General's service as local counsel for the MTC is not the private practice of law. *Cf. Duval Ranching Co. v. Glickman*, 930 F.Supp. 469 (D.Nev.1996).

Additionally, Attorneys General routinely assist each other by service as local counsel. States and state officers are often sued in other states, and sister states on frequent occasion assist with *pro hac vice* appearance. *See e.g.* Order approving *pro hac vice* appearance of Nevada counsel through California Attorney General's Office in *Beckner v. United States and Judge Susan Beckner*, Case no. CV08-7504 AG (JWJ) (Cent. Dist. Cal.). Exhibit 1.

II. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FREQUENTLY APPEARS AS AMICUS.

The Attorney General's function as amicus is a tradition of longstanding in American

Nevada Office of the Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701-4717 L 91 51 71 11

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

¹ See e.g. Nevada v. Hall, 440 U.S. 410 (1979), Nevada v. Hicks.533 U.S. 353 (2001), Nevada v. Hibbs, 538 U.S. 721 (2003).

jurisprudence. "[The authority of] the Attorney General . . . is broad and inclusive enough . . . to appear as amicus curiae before the United States Supreme Court in cases which may directly or indirectly impact upon state functions or administrative procedures and operations." *Young Americans For Freedom v. Gorton,* 588 P.2d 195 (Wash. 1978).

The singular position of the Attorney General to make known important views about the role of government is reflected in the practice of the U.S. Supreme Court, which frequently calls for the views of the Solicitor General. See David C. Thompson, An Empirical Analysis of Supreme Court Certiorari Petition Procedures: The Call for Response and the Call for the Views of the Solicitor General, 16 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 237 (2009).

Finally, the Nevada Attorney General in this State has a longstanding tradition of amicus appearances. See e.g. In re Report of Ormsby County Grand Jury, 74 Nev. 80, 322 P.2d 1099 (1958), McCormick v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court, 69 Nev. 214, 246 P.2d 805 (1952), Bopp v. Lino, 110 Nev. 1246, 885 P.2d 559 (1994), Ford Motor Credit Co. v. Crawford, 109 Nev. 616, 855 P.2d 1024 (1993).

Thus the role of amicus is an essential part of the Attorney General's function. The Office has every intention of fulfilling the requirements of representation required by SCR 42, and is fully capable of assessing the potential for conflict.

18 III. THE INTEREST OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND AMICI IN THIS CASE IS 19 PARTICULARLY HIGH.

This case is no ordinary tort action. It is a crucible of intersecting vital governmental interests. New law almost inevitably will be made, federalism law that has its incipiency in *Nevada v. Hall*, 440 U.S. 410, State tort and immunity law as recently evolved in *Martinez v. Maruszczak*, 123 Nev. 433, 168 P.3d 720, 728 (2007). The Nevada Attorney General would be remiss to stand by in silence.

- 25 ////
- 26 ///
- 27 1///
- 28 ////

Nevada Office of the Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701-4717 L 91 G 71 P 10 C

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

	1	CONCLUSION
Nevada Office of the Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701-4717	2	The Court would be well served by the articulation of the interests of the states and the
	3	MTC. The Attorney General is fully within her authority to present these views for the Court's
	4	consideration. Therefore, respectfully, the Motion to Strike the Attorney General's
	5	Concurrence should be denied.
	6	Respectfully submitted this 6th day of August 2009.
	7	CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO,
	8	Attorney General for the State of Nevada By: <u>/s/ C. Wayne Howle</u>
	9	C. Wayne Howle Solicitor General
	10	Local Counsel Nevada State Bar No. 3443
	11	100 North Carson Street
	12	Carson City, Nevada 89701 Telephone No. (775) 684-1227
	13	Facsimile No. (775) 684-1108
	14	
	15 16	
	17	
	17 18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
		4

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

	LODGED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
	FEB 2 3 2009
	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BY DEPUTY
	DISTRICT COURT
GLENN ELLIOTT BECKNER, individually, Plaintiff(s)	CASE NUMBER CV08-7504 AG (JWJ)
v. UNITED STATES, a corporation, et al.	ORDER CONTRICT OF CALIFORNI DEPUT
Defendant(s).	APPLICATION OF NON-RESIDENT ATTORNEY TO APPEAR IN A SPECIFIC CASE
The Court, having reviewed the accompanying A	Application of <u>C. Wayne Howle</u> , Applicant=s Name
of <u>St. of Nevada Office of the Attorney General, 1</u>	00 N. Carson St., Carson City, NV 89701
775-684-1227 Telephone Number	<u>WHowle@ag.nv.gov</u> E-mail Address
for permission to appear and participate in the above-ent	
and the designation of Joel A. Davis, Supervising Deput Local Counsel Designee /State Bar Num	
of <u>California Department of Justice, 300 S. Spring Stre</u> Local Counse	et, Los Angeles, CA 90013 6/ Firm / Address
213-897-2130; Calnet: 8-647-2130 Telephone Number	Joel.Davis@doj.ca.gov E-mail Address
as local counsel, hereby ORDERS the Application be:	
G GRANTED	
G DENIED. Fee, if paid, shall be returned by the	CIEIK.
Dated <u>Februar</u> 25,2009	S. D. Magistrate Judge JEAFREY W.JOHNSON
ORIGINAL	

	1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
	2	I hereby certify that true and correct copies of this Opposition to Respondent Gilbert P.
	3	Hyatt's (1) Opposition to Motion by Multistate Tax Commission for Leave to File Amicus
	4	Curiae Brief; (2) Motion to Strike Amicus Curiae Brief of the State of Utah; (3) Motion to Strike
	5	Notice of Concurrence were served on the following counsel of record this 6th day of August,
	6	2009, by first class mail, postage pre-paid to the addresses show below:
	7 8	Robert L. Eisenberg Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg 6005 Plumas Street, Suite 300
	9	Reno, Nevada 89519
eral	10	Pat Lundvall McDonald Carano Wilson LLP
, Gené st 717	11	2300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 1000 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
ottorney Ge on Street 89701-4717	12 13	Carla Higginbotham
la Office of the A 100 North Cars Carson City, NV	13	McDonald Carano Wilson LLP 100 W. Liberty Street, 10 th Floor Reno, Nevada 89501
	15	(Counsel for Appellant/Cross-Respondent California Franchise Tax Board)
	16	Peter C. Bernhard, Esq.
Nevad	17	Kummer, Kaempfer, Bonner, Renshaw & Ferrario 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
	18	Seventh Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
	19 20	Mark A. Hutchison, Esg.
	20	Hutchison & Steffen
	21 22	Peccole Professional Park 10080 West Alta Drive, Suite 200
	22	Las Vegas, NV 89145
	24	(Counsel for Respondent/Cross Appellant Gilbert B. Hyatt)
	25	Shone T. Pierre Attorney for the Secretary and the
	26	Louisiana Department of Revenue Office of Legal Affairs
	27	P.O. Box 66258 Baton Rouge, LA 70896
	28	
		5

Anne Milgram Attorney General State of New Jersey Hughes Justice Complex P.O.Box 080 25 Market Street Trenton, NJ 08625 ulu Boarren By: Vicki Beavers, SLS Office of the Attorney General Nevada Office of the Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701-4717