IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

3 4 CISILIE A. VAILE, 5 S.C. DOCKET NO. 36969 Petitioner, D.C. CASE NO. D 230385 6 7 EIGHTH IUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF 8 NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; FAMILY LAW 9 DIVISION, THE HONORABLE CYNTHIA DIANE STEEL, DISTRICT 10 FILED JUDGE, 11 Respondent. FEB 26 2001 12 and 13 R. SCOTLUND VAILE, 14 Real Party in Interest. 15

R. SCOTLUND VAILE'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBITS, POST ORAL ARGUMENT, RELATING TO PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND WRIT OF PROHIBITION

Following a tactic which has become all too disturbing through the course of the instant Petitions for Writ, Petitioner once again comes before this Court seeking to supplement the factual record and engaging in unsupported argument. What should be of import to this Court is the factual record that was brought before Judge Steel and the conclusions she was able to reach on that factual record after hearing the living testimony of the involved parties. It is respectfully submitted the instant Motion to Supplement provides no further insight on any of those concerns.

Despite the chimerical assertions about what light the Norway decision sheds upon the veracity of Mr. Vaile, the simple truth is the Order of the appellate court simply finds the municipal court in Oslo has jurisdiction to consider that allegations raised by Petitioner

Law Offices of CANNON GORLINGS, O'ISON, CANNON GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX A Professional Corporation 301 EAST CLARK AVENCE, SUITE 1000 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101-6597 (702) 384-4012 TELECOPIER (702) 383-0701

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

RAWI GORI 301 E.

before that Court. It does not establish the habitual residence of the children. It does not establish that Mr. Vaile never intended to live in Las Vegas.

Interestingly, however, on the issue of veracity, it does establish Petitioner lied to this Court, and to Judge Steel, when she asserted Norwegian court proceedings were in place prior to Mr. Vaile seeking a declaration from Judge Steel that the children should be given to him because of the unilateral breach of their agreement by Petitioner. This Court will recall the assertion made to it was that this Norwegian court proceeding was started in November of 1999 and that Mr. Vaile lied to Judge Steel when, in February of 2000, he requested the return of his children but failed to mention the Norwegian "court" proceeding. On page 2 of the translated opinion of the Appellant Court, 1 specifically noted that while Mr. Vaile made his request to the Eighth Judicial District Court on February 18, 2000, it was not until over a month later that Petitioner made her first complaint through the Oslo Municipal Court that the children should live with her. Thus the representations by Mr. Vaile made to Judge Steel and to this Court on Petition were completely appropriate. There was no pending court action in a foreign jurisdiction to be discussed to the Judge at the time she entered her proper ruling regarding the propriety of Petitioner's behavior.

In addition, the proposed exhibit fails to address the fundamental issues to be determined as it relates to the Hague Convention determination which Judge Steel properly declined to issue. As indicated in the moving papers² it was argued a fundamental factor of a court--in order to make a proper Hague Convention determination--is that the children be physically within the ambit of the court's jurisdiction. Nothing in the translated Norwegian Appellate Decision sheds any light on those allegations or on those factors. At best, it was

¹It should be noted, at this point, the allegedly translated opinion fails to contain an affidavit from the translator indicating their ability or competency to make a translation and, therefore, its accuracy is subject to question.

²Petitioner asserts to this Court the matter has not been fully briefed and yet the Court has before it legal pleadings replete with citations to appropriate jurisprudential decisions and evidentiary exhibits, upon which it is requested to rely in rendering its decision.

established that the children did not live in Las Vegas and, therefore, Judge Steel was correct in declining to issue a Hague Convention determination when she did not have jurisdiction over the physical person of the children.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff is, once again, simply attempting to muddy the waters regarding the proper decision by Judge Steel. The proposed citation is not only irrelevant, Petitioner's argument as to what light will be shed by these documents is also inaccurate and irrelevant. Accordingly, this request should be denied.

DATED this day of February, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,

RAWLINGS, OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY & DESPUTSSEAUX

301 E. Clark Averue, Suite 1000

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Real Party in Interest

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the ZZIVI day of February, 2001, I mailed a copy
of the foregoing R. SCOTLUND VAILE'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER'S
MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBITS, POST
ORAL ARGUMENT, RELATING TO PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS
AND WRIT OF PROHIBITION to the following parties at their last known address,
postage fully prepaid thereon:

MARSHAL S. WILLICK, ESQ. 3551 E. Bonanza Road, Suite 101 Las Vegas, Nevada 89110 Attorney for Cisilie A. Vaile

An Employee of RAWLINGS, OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX