IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

INDICATE FULL CAPTION:

WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC., a Nevada Corporation,

Appellant(s),

vs.

13

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT and) THE HONORABLE JESSIE WALSH,)

Respondent(s),

and

VEGAS VP, LP, a Nevada Limited Partnership,

Real Party in Interest.

NO. 54389

DOCKETING STATEMENT CIVIL APPEALS

FILED

SEP 0 9 2009



GENERAL INFORMATION

All appellants not in proper person must complete this docketing statement. NRAP 14(a). The purpose of the docketing statement is to assist the Supreme Court in screening jurisdiction, classifying cases for en banc, panel, or expedited treatment, compiling statistical information and identifying parties and their counsel.

WARNING

This statement must be completed fully, accurately and on time. NRAP 14(c). The Supreme Court may impose sanctions on counsel or appellant if it appears that the information provided is incomplete or inaccurate. *Id*. Failure to attach requested documents, fill out the statement completely, or to file it in a timely manner constitutes grounds for the imposition of sanctions, including a fine and/or dismissal of the appeal.

This court has noted that when attorneys do not take seriously their obligations under NRAP 14 to complete the docketing statement properly and conscientiously, they waste the valuable judicial resources of this court, making the imposition of sanctions appropriate. *See* KDI Sylvan Pools v. Workman, 107 Nev. 340, 344, 810 P.2d 1217, 1220 (1991). Please use tab dividers to separate any attached documents.



Page 1 of 10

1. Judicial District <u>Eighth Judicial District Court</u> County <u>Clark</u> District Ct. Case No. <u>A587179</u> Department X Judge <u>Hon. Jessie Walsh</u>

2. Attorney filing this docketing statement:

51

Attorney	Jean A. Weil Te	lephone	702-314-1905
Firm	Weil & Drage, APC	· · · ·	
Address	6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203, Las	S Vegas, NV	89103
Client(s)	WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.	-	

If this is a joint statement by multiple appellants, add the names and addresses of other counsel and the names of their clients on an additional sheet accompanied by a certification that they concur in the filing of this statement.

3. Attorney(s) representing respondent(s): Unknown. However, VEGAS VP, LP was represented by the following attorneys in the District Court proceedings:

Attorney	Mark E. Ferrario, Esq., Tami D. Cowden, Esq., Lisa J. Zastrow, Esq.
Telephone	(702) 792-7000/Fax: (702) 796-7181
Firm	KUMMER, KAEMPFER, BONNER, RENSHAW & FERRARIO
Address	3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 7 th Floor, Las Vegas, NV 89169
	VEGAS VP, LP

(List additional counsel on separate sheet if necessary)

4. Nature of disposition below (check all that apply):

Judgment after bench trial Judgment after jury verdict Summary judgment Default judgment Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief	Dismissal: Lack of jurisdiction Failure to state a claim Failure to prosecute Other (specify):
Grant/Denial of injunction Grant/Denial of declaratory relief Review of agency determination	Divorce decree: Original Modification Other disposition (specify): <u>Review of</u> Arbitration Award

5. Does this appeal raise issues concerning any of the following?

Child custody
Venue
Adoption

Termination of parental rights Grant/Denial of injunction or TRO Juvenile matters

N/A

3.

6. **Pending and prior proceedings in this court.** List the case name and docket number of all appeals or original proceedings presently or previously pending before this court which are related to this appeal:

N/A

7. Pending and prior proceedings in other courts. List the case name, number and court of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts which are related to this appeal (*e.g.*, bankruptcy, consolidated or bifurcated proceedings) and their dates of disposition:

N/A

8. Nature of the action. Briefly describe the nature of the action, including a list of the causes of action pleaded, and the result below:

This dispute arises out of a contract wherein Vegas VP, LP ("Vegas VP") engaged WPH Architecture, Inc. ("WPH") to perform certain architectural services for a mid-rise condominium project known as the Metropolis Lofts and Flats located in Las Vegas, Nevada (the "Project"). After an unsuccessful mediation on or about March 7, 2007, Vegas VP filed and arbitration demand with the American Arbitration Association ("AAA") for claims of architectural malpractice against WPH related to the Project. The underlying two-week arbitration took place was before an AAA panel of arbitrators (the "Panel") and resulted in the Panel's January 6, 2009 Award of a complete defense verdict for WPH.

Thereafter, WPH submitted to the Panel a Post-Award Motion for Costs, Attorney's Fees and Interest, because, among other things, WPH had previously served two statutory Offers of Judgment, pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 68 and Nevada Revised Statutes 17.115, to Vegas VP, both of which were rejected. The Panel denied WPH's Post-Award Motion.

On April 7, 2009, WPH filed a motion in the Eighth Judicial District Court to, among other things, confirm in part, modify or correct the Award to order Vegas VP to pay WPH with its costs, attorneys' fees and interest as a result of Vegas VP rejecting both of WPH'S statutory Offers of Judgment. The Eighth Judicial District Court subsequently ordered that WPH's subject motion to modify or correct the Award be denied. However, the District Court failed to otherwise confirm the remainder of the Award. Thereafter, WPH filed a motion to clarify the District Court's Order regarding confirmation of the Award. The District Court granted WPH's motion to clarify and issued a second Order confirming the Award. WPH now appeals from the Eighth Judicial District Court's Order denying WPH'S subject motion to modify or correct the Award. To the extent that the District Court's second Order confirming the remainder of the Award grants WPH standing to appeal, WPH appeals same.

9. Issues on appeal. State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal (attach separate sheets as necessary):

The principal issue in this appeal is whether Nevada's statutory Offers of Judgment, as set forth in NRCP 68 and NRS 17.115, apply to arbitration proceedings venued in Nevada when (i) an agreement provides that arbitration proceedings are governed by the laws of the Nevada, (ii) the Project which is the subject of the dispute is located in Nevada and (iii) throughout the entirety of the arbitration proceedings, including the entire prehearing and hearing briefings, the parties and the Panel cited, relied upon and applied Nevada law.

The arbitration Panel did not believe it had jurisdiction to rule on the issue because it is a matter of first impression in Nevada. The District Court did not explain its Order in denying WPH's subject motion to modify or correct the Award.

10. **Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues.** If you are aware of any proceeding presently pending before this court which raises the same or similar issues raised in this appeal, list the case name and docket number and identify the same or similar issues raised:

N/A

22

11. **Constitutional issues.** If this appeal challenges the constitutionality of a statute, and the state, any state agency, or any officer or employee thereof is not a party to this appeal, have you notified the clerk of this court and the attorney general in accordance with NRAP 44 and NRS 30.130?

\boxtimes	N/A
	Yes
	No

If not, explain:

12. Other issues. Does this appeal involve any of the following issues?

- Reversal of well-settled Nevada precedent (on an attachment, identify the case(s))
- An issue arising under the United States and/or Nevada Constitutions
- A substantial issue of first impression
- An issue of public policy

An issue where en banc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of this court's

decisions

. -

A ballot question

If so, explain: It is a substantial issue of first impression whether Nevada's statutory Offers of Judgment, as set forth in NRCP 68 and NRS 17.115, apply to arbitration proceedings. It is an issue of public policy, because Nevada's statutory Offers of Judgment have the purpose of encouraging settlement of lawsuits before trial and the promotion of such a purpose can be achieved in a district court as well as in arbitration proceedings.

13. Trial. If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last? <u>N/A</u>

Was it a bench or jury trial? N/A

14. **Judicial disqualification.** Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from participation in this appeal? If so, which Justice?

No.

TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

15. Date of entry of written judgment or order appeal from 07/22/09 and 07/20/09. Attach a copy. If more than one judgment or order is appealed from, attach copies of each judgment or order from which this appeal is taken.

If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review:

16. Date written notice of entry of judgment or order served <u>07/24/09 and 07/23/09</u> Attach a copy, including proof of service, for each order or judgment appealed from.

Was service by: Delivery Mail

17. If the time for filing the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion (NRCP 50(b), 52(b), or 59),

(a) Specify the type of motion, the date and method of service of the motion, and the date of filing.

NRCP 50(b)	Date served	By delivery or by mail Date of filing
NRCP 52(b)	Date served	_By delivery or by mail Date of filing
NRCP 59	Date served	By delivery or by mail Date of filing

Attach copies of all post-trial tolling motions.

NOTE: Motions made pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration

do not toll the time for filing a notice of appeal.

N/A

..

(b) Date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion ______. Attach a copy.

N/A

(c) Date written notice of entry of order resolving tolling motion served ______. Attach a copy, including proof of service.

Was	service by:
	Delivery
\square	Mail

N/A

18. Date notice of appeal filed 08/19/09

If more than one party has appealed from the judgment or order, list the date each notice of appeal was filed and identify by name the party filing the notice of appeal: N/A.

19. Specify statute or rule governing the time limit for filing the notice of appeal, *e.g.*, NRAP 4(a), NRS 155.190, or other NRAP 4(a)

SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY

20. Specify the statute or other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review the judgment or order appealed from:

NRAP $3A(b)(1)$	
NRAP $3A(b)(2)$	
NRAP $3A(b)(3)$	
Other (specify)	<u>NRS 38.247</u>

y • -

NRS 155.190 (specify subsection)
 NRS 38.205 (specify subsection)

 NRS 703.376

Explain how each authority provides a basis for appeal from the judgment or order:

NRS 38.247(1)(c) provides that an appeal may be taken from an order confirming or denying confirmation of an arbitration award. NRS 38.247(2) provides that such an appeal must be taken as from an order or a judgment in a civil action.

The District Court denied WPH's motion to, among other things, confirm in part, modify or correct the Award to order Vegas VP to pay WPH its costs, attorneys' fees and interest as a result of Vegas VP rejecting both of WPH'S statutory Offers of Judgment. However, the District Court failed to otherwise confirm the remainder of the Award. WPH subsequently filed a motion to clarify pursuant to the provisions of NRS 38.241(4) and NRS 38.242(2) and the District Court made a second Order confirming the arbitration Award.

Thus, WPH appeals the District Court's Order denying its motion to, among other things, confirm in part, modify or correct the arbitration Award. To the extent that the second Order confirming the arbitration Award grants WPH standing to appeal, it appeals from the second Order.

COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SECTION ONLY IF MORE THAN ONE CLAIM FOR **RELIEF WAS PRESENTED IN THE ACTION (WHETHER AS A CLAIM,** COUNTERCLAIM, CROSS-CLAIM, OR THIRD-PARTY CLAIM) OR IF MULTIPLE PARTIES WERE INVOLVED IN THE ACTION.

N/A

Attach separate sheets as necessary.

21. List all parties involved in the action in the district court:

If all parties in the district court are not parties to this appeal, explain in detail why those parties are not involved in this appeal, e.g., formally dismissed, not served, or other:

22. Give a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate claims, counterclaims, cross-claims, or third-party claims, and the trial court's disposition of each claim, and how each claim was resolved (i.e., order, judgment, stipulation), and the date of disposition of each claim. Attach a copy of each disposition.

23. Attach copies of the last-filed version of all complaints, counterclaims, and/or crossclaims filed in the district court.

24. Did the judgment or order appealed from adjudicate ALL the claims alleged below and the rights and liabilities of ALL the parties to the action below?



¥ •

25. If you answered "No" to question 24, complete the following:

(a) Specify the claims remaining pending below:

(b) Specify the parties remaining below:

(c) Did the district court certify the judgment or order appealed from as a final judgment pursuant to NRCP 54(b)?

Yes No

If "Yes", attach a copy of the certification or order, including any notice of entry and proof of service.

(d) Did the district court make an express determination, pursuant to NRCP 54(b), that there is no just reason for delay and an express direction for the entry of judgment?

Yes No

26. If you answered "No" to any part of question 25, explain the basis for seeking appellate review (*e.g.*, order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)):

VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read this docketing statement, that the information provided in this docketing statement is true and complete to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I have attached all required documents to this docketing statement.

WPH ARCHITELTURE, INC. WEIL AND DRAGE, APC Name of appellant Name of counsel of record

9/8/09

Signature of counsel record

ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA State and county where signed

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the <u>s</u> day of September, 2009, I caused to be mailed and a copy of the foregoing **DOCKETING STATEMENT CIVIL APPEALS**, in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid, to the following counsel listed below:

Mark E. Ferrario, Esq. Tami D. Cowden, Esq. Lisa J. Zastrow, Esq. KUMMER, KAEMPFER, BONNER, RENSHAW & FERRARIO 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 7th Floor Las Vegas, NV 89169 (702) 792-7000/Fax: (702) 796-7181

Attorneys for Defendant, VEGAS VP, LP

Michelle R. Wood An employee of WEIL & DRAGE

ATTACHMENT "1"

N	
ORDR	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
JEAN A. WEIL, ESQ.	FILED
(Nevada Bar No. 006532)	
(Nevada Bar No. 011253)	Ju 22 4 19 PH
WEIL & DRAGE, APC	C
6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203 Las Vegas, Nevada 89103	CLERK OF THE COURT
(702) 314-1905 • Fax (702) 314-1909 Attorneys for Plaintiff,	
WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.	
EIGHTH JUDIC	IAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK C	OUNTY, NEVADA
WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC., a Nevada) CASE NO: A587179
Corporation,)) DEPT NO.: X
Plaintiff,)
VS.)
VEGAS VP, LP, a Nevada Limited)) ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTUR
Partnership,) INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN
Defendant.) PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THI) ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR
) CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD;
) (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING
) WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION) FOR COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND
) INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT
) ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS,) ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES
) Hearing Date: May 13, 2009
) Hearing Time: In Chambers
))
	
///	
11 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

1	ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN
2	PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING
3	WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND
4	INTEREST: AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS. ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES
5	Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S Motion: (1) To Confirm in Part and Vacate in
6	Part or, in the Alternative, to Modify and/or Correct the Arbitration Award; (2) To Correct an
7	Order Denying WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion for Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Interest; and (3)
8	For Judgment Along with Reasonable Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Expenses was heard in
9	chambers on May 13, 2009. The Court having considered the documents before it orders as
10	follows:
11	IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE,
12	INC.'S Motion: (1) To Confirm in Part and Vacate in Part or, in the Alternative, to Modify and/or
13	Correct the Arbitration Award; (2) To Correct an Order Denying WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion
14 ·	for Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Interest; and (3) For Judgment Along with Reasonable Costs,
15	Attorney's Fees, and Expenses is hereby DENIED.
16	IT IS SO ORDERED.
17	DATED this 2 day of July, 2009. JESSIE WALSH
18	DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
19	Respectfully submitted by:
20	WEIL & DRAGE, APC
21	#7495
22	M. Laure
23	JEAN A. WEIL, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 006532)
24	TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ.
25	(Nevada Bar No. 011253) 6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203
26	Las Vegas, NV 89103
27	
28	
	C: Ducaments and Settings MWand.WEILDRACIE:Lunal Sciences Tempurary Internet Files/OLK7C*Order confirming arbitration award and denying WPHs motion (5). Am
	Page 2 of 2

ATTACHMENT "2"

		• • • •
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		JUL 20 JO 50 AM '09 CLERA AL DISTRICT COURT UNTY, NEVADA
10	WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC., a Nevada) CASE NO: A587179
11	Corporation,)) DEPT NO.: X
12	Plaintiff,	
13 14	vs.))
15	VEGAS VP, LP, a Nevada Limited Partnership,) ORDER GRANTING WPH) ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION TO
16	Defendant.) CLARIFY COURT'S ORDER REGARDING
17	Delendant,) WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION:) (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE
18) IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO) MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE
19) ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT) AN ORDER DENYING WPH
20) ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR) COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND
21 22) INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT) ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS,
23) ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES)
24)) Hearing Date: July 8, 2009
25)) Hearing Time: In Chambers
26)
27	/// ///	
28		
	SyReadenied Commuteers v. Frger IP 2022.015 (EGAS VP v. WPH Pleadings (heler grown Do co	
	Pag	e 1 of 2

ORDER GRANTING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION TO CLARIFY COURT'S ORDER REGARDING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR COSTS. ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG WITH **REASONABLE COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES**

This matter, having come on for hearing on July 8, 2008 in Chambers for Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S Motion to Clarify Court's Order Regarding WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion: (1) to Confirm in Part and Vacate in Part or, in the Alternative, to Modify and/or Correct the Arbitration Award; (2) to Correct an Order Denying WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion for Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Interest; and (3) for Judgment Along with Reasonable Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Expenses, no opposition having been made thereto, and the Court having considered the papers and pleadings on file herein:

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, 13 INC.'S Motion to Clarify Court's Order Regarding WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion: (1) to 14 Confirm in Part and Vacate in Part or, in the Alternative, to Modify and/or Correct the Arbitration 15 Award; (2) to Correct an Order Denying WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion for Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Interest; and (3) for Judgment Along with Reasonable Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Expenses is hereby GRANTED and that the underlying arbitration award is hereby CONFIRMED. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this day of July, 2009.

JESSIE WALSH

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

WEIL & DRAGE, APC 22

> JEAN A. WEIL, ESO. (Nevada Bar No. 006532)

TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ.

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

28

24

26 (Nevada Bar No. 011253) 6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203 27 Las Vegas, NV 89103

nictors v. Vegas VP 2022.015 VEXAS VP v. WPH/Pleadings Order granting WPHs motion to clarify.dox

#6948

ATTACHMENT "3"

1	NEOJ	-11 ED	
2	JEAN A. WEIL, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 006532)	FILED Jul 27 3 38 PH '09	
3	TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ.	11 27 3 38 PM UD	
4	(Nevada Bar No. 011253) WEIL & DRAGE, APC	D and it	
5	6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203 Las Vegas, Nevada 89103	CLERK OF THE COURT	
6	(702) 314-1905 • Fax (702) 314-1909	UL L'''	
7	iweil@weildrage.com tresurreccion@weildrage.com		
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.		
9		ί τι διέφριστ σάμοτ	
10		IAL DISTRICT COURT	
11	CLARK C	OUNTY, NEVADA	
12	WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC., a Nevada Corporation,) CASE NO: A587179	
13) DEPT NO.: X	
14	Plaintiff,)	
15	VS.) NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING) WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION:	
16	VEGAS VP, LP, a Nevada Limited) (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE) IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO	
17) MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE	
18	Defendant.) ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT) AN ORDER DENYING WPH	
19) ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR) COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND	
20) INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT	
21) ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS,) ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES	
22			
23) Hearing Date: May 13, 2009	
24) Hearing Time: In Chambers	
25))	
26			
27			
28	111		
	S:Vesideniiul Constructors v. Vegas VP 2022.015:VBGAS VP v. WPH:Plankings:WOE Ord	er Denning WPH MTH to Confirm Art Awardukse	
	Page 1 of 3		

(1) 7 <u>M</u> C	ICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION: O CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO DIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR COSTS, ITORNEY'S FEES, AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES
TO:	ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:
	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S
MOT	ION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
то м	ODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT AN
ORDI	R DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR COSTS, ATTORNEY'S
FEES.	AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS,
ATTC	RNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES was entered in the above-entitled court on the 22 nd day of
July, 2	009. A copy of said ORDER is attached hereto.
	DATED this A day of July, 2009.
	WEIL & DRAGE, APC JEAN A. WEIL, ESQ. Nevada Bat No. 006532) TRESOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ. (Nevada Ban No. 011253) 6085 West J wain Avenue, Suite 203 Las Vegas, NV 89103 (702) 314-1905 • Fax (702) 314-1909 Attorneys for Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.
11	

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC. vs. VEGAS VP, LP
3	District Court Case No.: A587179
4	I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the $\frac{\partial y}{\partial day}$ of July, 2009, I caused to be mailed a copy of
5	the foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE,
6	INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE
7	ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2)
8	TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR
9	COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG
10	WITH REASONABLE COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES, in a sealed
11	envelope, postage prepaid, to the following counsel listed below:
12	Mark E. Ferrario, Esq.
13	Tami D. Cowden, Esq. Lisa J. Zastrow, Esq.
14	KUMMER, KAEMPFER, BONNER, RENSHAW & FERRARIO
15	3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 7 th Floor
16	Las Vegas, NV 89169 (702) 792-7000/Fax: (702) 796-7181
17	Attorneys for Defendant,
18	VEGAS VP, LP
19	J. h. h. h. h. k.
20	Michelle R. Wood
21	An employee of WEIL & DRAGE
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	S; Residential Constructors v. Vegox VP 2022.015WEGAS VP v. WPHPleadingsNOE (Inder Denying WPH MTN to Confirm Arb Award.dos
	Page 3 of 3

1 ORDR	
2 JEAN A. WEIL, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 006532)	FILED
3 TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ.	
(Nevada Bar No. 011253)	Ju 22 4 19 PN 1
4 WEIL & DRAGE, APC 6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203	S P-TT
Las Vegas, Nevada 89103	CI FRK OF THE
(702) 314-1905 • Fax (702) 314-1909	CLERK OF THE COURT
Attorneys for Plaintiff,	
WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.	
	CIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK (COUNTY, NEVADA
WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC., a Nevada) CASE NO: A587179
Corporation,)
Plaintiff,) DEPT NO.: X
riantiii,)
VS.)
VEGAS VP, LP, a Nevada Limited)) ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE
Partnership,) INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN
) PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE
Defendant.) ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR) CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD;
) (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING
) WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION
) FOR COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND
) INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT) ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS,
) ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES
)
)) Hearing Data: Mar. 12, 2000
) Hearing Date: May 13, 2009
) Hearing Time: In Chambers
C Documents and Settings MWand WEILDRACE Land Settings Temporary Internet File	

ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS. **ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES**

1

2

3

4

5	Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S Motion: (1) To Confirm in Part and Vacate in		
6	Part or, in the Alternative, to Modify and/or Correct the Arbitration Award; (2) To Correct an		
7	Order Denying WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion for Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Interest; and (3)		
8.	For Judgment Along with Reasonable Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Expenses was heard in		
9	chambers on May 13, 2009. The Court having considered the documents before it orders as		
10	follows:		
11	IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE.		
12	INC.'S Motion: (1) To Confirm in Fart and Vacate in Part or, in the Alternative, to Modify and/or		
13	Correct the Arbitration Award; (2) To Correct an Order Denying WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion		
14	for Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Interest; and (3) For Judgment Along with Reasonable Costs,		
15	Attorney's Fees, and Expenses is hereby DENIED.		
16	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
17	DATED this 2 day of July, 2009. JESSIE WALSH		
18	DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
19	Respectfully submitted by:		
20	WEIL & DRAGE, APC		
21	h. Laure #7495		
22			
23	JEAM A. WEIL, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 006532)		
24	TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 011253)		
25	(Nevada Bar No. 011253) 6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203		
26	Las Vegas, NV 89103		
27			
28			
	C The unersts and Settings MW and WEILIRACH: Lucal Senarges Temporary Internet Files (ILETC: Order confirming or intrusion doesed and denying WPHz motion (5). doe		
	Page 2 of 2		

ATTACHMENT "4"

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	NEOJ JEAN A. WEIL, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 006532) TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 011253) WEIL & DRAGE, APC 6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203 Las Vegas, Nevada 89103 (702) 314-1905 • Fax (702) 314-1909 <u>iweil/a/weildrage.com</u> <u>tresurreccion@/weildrage.com</u> Attorneys for Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.	FILED Jul 23 3 24 PH '09
9	EIGHTH JUDICI	AL DISTRICT COURT
10	CLARK CO	DUNTY, NEVADA
11	WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC., a Nevada) CASE NO: A587179
12 13	Corporation,)) DEPT NO.: X
13	Plaintiff.)
15	VS.) NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER) GRANTING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S
16	VEGAS VP. I.P., a Nevada Limited Partnership.) MOTION TO CLARIFY COURT'S ORDER
17) REGARDING WPH ARCHITECTURE,) INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN
18	Defendant.) PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE) ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR
19) CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD;) (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING
20) WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION) FOR COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND
21) INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT) ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS,
22) ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES
23 24		/)) Hearing Date: July 9, 2009
24 25) Hearing Date: July 8, 2009)
26) Hearing Time: In Chambers)
27)
28	///	
	S-Resulential Constructors v. Segue 19 2022 BIS STAIAS 17 v. 1974 Pleadings NSE (Inder	Granny WPH MTS in Clarify Court (John die
	Pag	ge 1 of 3
1	•	1

I

• [•

1	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER GRANTING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION		
2	TO CLARIFY COURT'S ORDER REGARDING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S		
2	MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD: (2)		
_	TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR		
4	<u>COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG</u> <u>WITH REASONABLE COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES</u>		
5	TO: ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:		
6	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an ORDER GRANTING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S		
7	MOTION TO CLARIFY COURT'S ORDER REGARDING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S		
8	MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,		
9	TO MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT AN		
10 11	ORDER DENYING WHI ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR COSTS, ATTORNEY'S		
11	FEES, AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS,		
12	ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES was entered in the above-entitled court on the 20 th day of		
13	July. 2009. A copy of said ORDER is attached hereto.		
15	DATED this 23 day of July, 2009.		
16			
17	WEIL & DRAGE, APC		
18	The #6448		
19	JEANA. WEIL, ESQ.		
20	(Nevada Bar No. 006532) TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ.		
21	(Nevada Bar No. 011253) 6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203		
22	Las Vegas, NV 89103		
23	(702) 314-1905 • Fax (702) 314-1909 Attorneys for Plaintiff,		
24	WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.		
25			
26			
27	111		
28	111		
	N. Revolement Construction v. Sugar CP 2022,012 VEGAN VDA, WPH Pleasings NOI, Order Circuiting WPH MIN 013 South Const Order den		
	Page 2 of 3		

€, _____

€ • 2 − 8 •			
	CEDTIFICATE OF SEDVICE		
1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC. vs. VEGAS VP, LP		
2	District Court Case No.: A587179		
3			
4	I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the $\underline{\lambda}$ day of July, 2009, I caused to be mailed a copy of		
5	the foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER GRANTING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S		
6	MOTION TO CLARIFY COURT'S ORDER REGARDING WPH ARCHITECTURE,		
7	INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE		
8	ALTERNATIVE, TO MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR		
9 10	COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG		
11	WITH REASONABLE COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES, in a sealed		
12	envelope, postage prepaid, to the following counsel listed below:		
13	Mark E. Ferrario, Esq.		
14	Tami D. Cowden, Esq. Lisa J. Zastrow, Esq.		
15	KUMMER, KAEMPFER, BONNER,		
16	RENSHAW & FERRARIO 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 7 th Floor		
17	Las Vegas, NV 89169 (702) 792-7000/Fax: (702) 796-7181		
18	Attorneys for Defendant,		
19	VEGAS VP, LP		
20			
21	Michelle R. Wood		
22	An employee of WEIL & DRAGE		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	S. Resultation Construction & Vigory CP 2022-015 VELIAS (19 9, WPI) Pleadings 300; Order Granting WPH MEN to Cloridy Court Dider doc		
	Page 3 of 3		

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ORDR JEAN A. WEIL, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 006532) TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 011253) WEIL & DRAGE, APC 6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203 Las Vegas, Nevada 89103 (702) 314-1905 • Fax (702) 314-1909 Attorneys for Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.	JUL 20 JO 50 AN JUS CLIMAN JUST
8	EIGHTH JUDIC	IAL DISTRICT COURT
9	CLARK C	OUNTY, NEVADA
10 11	WPH ACCHITECTURE, INC., a Nevada Corporation,) CASE NO: A587179
12	Plaintiff,) DEPT NO.: X
13 14	VS.	
15	VEGAS VP, LP, a Nevada Limited Partnership,) ORDER GRANTING WPH) ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION TO
16	Defendant.) CLARIFY COURT'S ORDER REGARDING) WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION:) (1) TO CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE
17 18) IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO) MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE
19) ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT) AN ORDER DENYING WPH
20) ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR
21) COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND) INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT
22) ALONG WITH REASONABLE COSTS,) ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES
23		
24) Hearing Date: July 8, 2009)
25 26) Hearing Time: In Chambers _)
27 28	/// ///	
	S-Resultentud Constructures v. Vegas VP 2023 015 VECIAS VP v. WITH Pleadings (Joder grou PA	ning WPHs manush in clarify.din. gelof2

ORDER GRANTING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION TO CLARIFY COURT'S ORDER REGARDING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION: (1) TO **CONFIRM IN PART AND VACATE IN PART OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO** MODIFY AND/OR CORRECT THE ARBITRATION AWARD; (2) TO CORRECT AN ORDER DENYING WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S MOTION FOR COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND INTEREST; AND (3) FOR JUDGMENT ALONG WITH **REASONABLE COSTS. ATTORNEY'S FEES, AND EXPENSES**

This matter, having come on for hearing on July 8, 2008 in Chambers for Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, INC.'S Motion to Clarify Court's Order Regarding WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion: (1) to Confirm in Part and Vacate in Part or, in the Alternative, to Modify and/or Correct the Arbitration Award; (2) to Correct an Order Denying WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion for Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Interest; and (3) for Judgment Along with Reasonable Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Expenses, no opposition having been made thereto, and the Court having considered the papers and pleadings on file herein:

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff, WPH ARCHITECTURE, 13 INC.'S Motion to Clarify Court's Order Regarding WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion: (1) to 14 Confirm in Part and Vacate in Part or, in the Alternative, to Modify and/or Correct the Arbitration 15 Award; (2) to Correct an Order Denying WPH Architecture, Inc.'s Motion for Costs, Attorney's 16 Fees, and Interest; and (3) for Judgment Along with Reasonable Costs, Attorney's Fees, and 17 Expenses is hereby GRANTED and that the underlying arbitration award is hereby CONFIRMED. 18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 DATED this <u>1</u> day of July, 2009. 20

Essie wai sh

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

WEIL & DRAGE, APC

JEAN A. WEIL, ESQ. (Nevada Bar No. 006532) 25 TREVOR O. RESURRECCION, ESQ.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

22

23

24

28

26 (Nevada Bar No. 011253) 6085 West Twain Avenue, Suite 203 27 Las Vegas, NV 89103

y, WPH Pleadings Order grouning WPHs mation to clarify (

46.143