

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kje@kempjones.com

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Principal Investments, Inc. d/b/a Rapid  
Cash; Granite Financial Services, Inc.  
d/b/a Rapid Cash; FMMR Investments,  
Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash; Prime Group, Inc.  
d/b/a Rapid Cash; and Advance Group,  
Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash,

Appellants,

vs.

The EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT of the State of Nevada, in and  
for the County of Clark; and THE  
HONORABLE ELIZABETH GOFF  
GONZALEZ, District Judge,

Respondents,

Casandra Harrison; Eugene Varcados;  
Concepcion Quintino; and Mary  
Dungan,

Respondents.

Principal Investments, Inc. d/b/a Rapid  
Cash; Granite Financial Services, Inc.  
d/b/a Rapid Cash; FMMR Investments,  
Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash; Prime Group, Inc.  
d/b/a Rapid Cash; and Advance Group,  
Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash,

Appellants,

vs.

The EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT of the State of Nevada, in and  
for the County of Clark; and THE  
HONORABLE ELIZABETH GOFF  
GONZALEZ, District Judge,

Respondents,

Casandra Harrison; Eugene Varcados;  
Concepcion Quintino; and Mary  
Dungan,

Real Parties in Interest.

Case No. 57625

Electronically Filed  
THE CLASSIFIED RESPONSE TO p.m.  
RAPID CASH'S MOTION TO  
CONSOLIDATE CASES  
Clerk of Supreme Court

*(Entered in 57371-60)*

Case No. 59837

*12-18080*

*4-9-12*

## INTRODUCTION

Rapid Cash<sup>1</sup> asks this Court to consolidate its:

- twice-rejected petition for writ of mandamus, and
- untimely appeal from the district court's denial of its first motion to compel arbitration, which is subject to a pending motion to dismiss,

into its third action before this Court—the appeal from the district court's denial of its second motion to compel arbitration. Rapid Cash urges consolidation on the basis that all three of these proceedings challenge the district court's conclusion that Rapid Cash waived its contractual right to arbitration by litigating to judgment nearly 17,000 claims arising under those contracts, and thus, this now-certified class of judgment debtors cannot be forced to arbitrate their claims that those judgments are void because they were obtained through a fraud on the court. Rapid Cash's matters should not **now** be consolidated because the fate of two of these three proceedings is uncertain, and its motion should be denied as premature.

## ARGUMENT

Rapid Cash's request is premature because the continued existence of the two oldest of its cases—the dismissed writ petition and the untimely first appeal—is in doubt. The Class's renewed motion to dismiss Rapid Cash's untimely appeal from the district court's denial of its first motion to compel arbitration (#57625) has been fully briefed and submitted,<sup>2</sup> and the Class filed its answer to Rapid Cash's petition for en banc reconsideration of the panel's dismissal (and denied rehearing) of Rapid Cash's petition for writ of mandamus on March 20, 2012.<sup>3</sup> Judicial economy will be better served if this Court waits until after it decides whether or not to dispose of Cases

---

<sup>1</sup> Principal Investments, Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash; Granite Financial Services, Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash; FMMR Investments, Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash; Prime Group, Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash; and Advance Group, Inc. d/b/a Rapid Cash.

<sup>2</sup> #57625, Doc. 11-39605, 12-01755 & 12-03897.

<sup>3</sup> See #57371, Doc. 12-08710.

1 57371 and 57625—decisions that could easily moot this consolidation  
2 request—before it contemplates consolidating these cases into what may be the only  
3 matter still pending (#59837). At a minimum, one of these matters (either the petition  
4 or the untimely appeal) will be extinguished because they both seek mutually  
5 exclusive relief from the very same district court order. Until this Court knows the  
6 fate of those matters, this motion is patently premature.

7 If the petition survives, consolidation still would not be appropriate. NRAP  
8 3(b) permits appeals to be consolidated with other “appeals.” See NEV. R. APP. PROC.  
9 3(b)(2). Although this Court has cited NRAP 3(b) when consolidating writ petitions  
10 with other writ petitions, see e.g. *Barnes v. District Court*, 748 P.2d 483, 484 (Nev.  
11 1987), that does not suggest that combining original proceedings with appellate  
12 matters would be similarly appropriate. See e.g. *Karow v. Mitchell*, 878 P.2d 978, 981  
13 (Nev. 1994) (“Thus, we deny Matrillaro’s petition for a writ of mandamus . . . . [t]he  
14 arguments tendered in support of that petition, however, may be reviewed in the  
15 context of Martillaro’s appeal. . . .”).<sup>4</sup> Rapid Cash attempts to whittle the square peg  
16 of its petition for writ of mandamus to fit the round hole created by NRAP 3(b) for  
17 consolidating appellate cases of corresponding type by proffering, in a footnote, sound  
18 bites from its argument for en banc reconsideration of the panel’s denial of Rapid  
19 Cash’s petition for writ of mandamus. Compare Case #57371, Doc. 12-02756 with  
20 Motion at n.2. But that argument is unpersuasive,<sup>5</sup> and because it must first be  
21 evaluated by this Court in the context of Rapid Cash’s petition for en banc  
22 reconsideration, is yet another reason this motion is premature.

23 The Class acknowledges that consolidation might be appropriate if this Court  
24 does not dismiss Rapid Cash’s first appeal as untimely. But until and unless such a  
25

26 <sup>4</sup> Consolidation only at the time of disposition further supports the Class’s argument  
27 that consolidation is premature here.

28 <sup>5</sup> The Class incorporates herein its arguments, and points and authorities in support  
thereof, answering Rapid Cash’s petition for en banc reconsideration of the panel’s  
dismissal of its petition for writ of mandamus. Case #57371, Doc. 12-08710.

1 decision is made, consolidation remains premature and procedurally inappropriate.  
2 Accordingly, the Class respectfully requests that this Court deny Rapid Cash's instant  
3 motion to consolidate these matters.

4 DATED this 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012.

5 Respectfully Submitted by Class Counsel:

6 **KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP**

7  
8 By: /s/ Jennifer C. Dorsey

9 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (1927)

10 Jennifer C. Dorsey, Esq. (6456)

11 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

12 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy, 17th Floor

13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

14 irj@kempjones.com

15 **LEGAL AID CENTER OF**  
16 **SOUTHERN NEVADA, INC.**

17 Dan L. Wulz, Esq. (5557)

18 Venicia Considine, Esq. (11544)

19 800 South Eighth Street

20 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

21 dwulz@lacsns.org

22 *Class Counsel*  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

2 1. I hereby certify that this response complies with the formatting  
3 requirements of NRAP 27(d)(1), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the  
4 type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because:

5 [X] It has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft  
6 Word 2007 with 14 point, double-spaced Times New Roman font.

7 2. I further certify that this brief complies with the page-or-type-volume  
8 limitations of NRAP 27(d)(2) because it:

9 [X] Does not exceed 10 pages.

10 DATED this 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012.

11 Respectfully Submitted by Class Counsel:

12 **KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP**

13 By: /s/ Jennifer C. Dorsey

14 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (1927)

15 Jennifer C. Dorsey, Esq. (6456)

16 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

17 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy, 17th Floor

18 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

19 jrj@kempjones.com

20 **LEGAL AID CENTER OF**  
21 **SOUTHERN NEVADA, INC.**

22 Dan L. Wulz, Esq. (5557)

23 Venicia Considine, Esq. (11544)

24 800 South Eighth Street

25 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

26 dwulz@lacsns.org

27 *Class Counsel*

28  
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kje@kempjones.com

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012, the foregoing **THE CLASS'S**  
3 **RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO RAPID CASH'S MOTION TO**  
4 **CONSOLIDATE CASES** was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court.  
5 Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the  
6 Master Service List as follows:

7  
8 Mark S. Dzarnoski, Esq.  
9 Gordon & Silver, Ltd.  
3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 9<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

10  
11 /s/ Angela Embrey  
12 An employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com