

1 **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

2
3 KIRK ROSS HARRISON,

4 Appellant,

5 v.

6
7 VIVIAN MARIE LEE HARRISON,

8 Respondent.

Supreme Court Electronically Filed
District Court Case No. 2015-00016 Jun 02 2015 08:22 a.m.
Tracie K. Lindeman
Clerk of Supreme Court

9
10 **RESPONDENT’S RENEWED OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR**
11 **PERMISSION TO FILE REPLY TO FAST TRACK RESPONSE, AND TO FILE**
12 **SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX¹**

13 Respondent, Vivian Marie Lee Harrison (“Vivian”) opposes Appellant Kirk Ross Harrison’s
14 (“Kirk”) Motion to file a Reply to Respondent’s Fast Track Response, and to file a Supplemental
15 Appendix.

16 **I.**

17 **APPELLANT’S CLAIMED NEED FOR ADDITIONAL BRIEFING SHOULD BE DECIDED BY**
18 **THE FAST TRACK PROCESS**

19 The design of the fast track process is to allow the appellate Court an initial review of custody
20 matters to determine whether those issues could be addressed expeditiously through the fast track
21 briefing process. The Rules grant this Court the option to require further briefing after review of the fast
22 track briefs. NRAP 3(g)(1). Kirk first requested that the matters to be addressed by the Court – his
23 challenge of the stipulated “teenage discretion” provision and the stipulated appointment of a Parenting
24 Coordinator - be removed from the fast track. *See*, Motion to Remove from Fast Track Program filed
25
26

27
28 ¹ On June 1, 2015, Appellant re-filed his Motion for Permission to File Reply, et al based upon the Court’s Order dated May 20, 2015. Therefore, Respondent files the present Renewed Opposition to Appellant’s Motion for Permission to File Reply, et al. Except for the title of this pleading and the addition of this footnote, no other changes have been made to the content of the Opposition.

1 February 27, 2015. This Court denied that Motion but granted, upon Kirk's second motion, an increase
2 of words from the normal limit in his Fast Track Statement. Respondent Vivian Harrison, filed her
3 response within the word limit prescribed by NRAP 32.
4

5 Kirk's fundamental argument on appeal is that the district court erred by enforcing the terms of a
6 *stipulated* parenting plan. On appeal Kirk requests that this Court find that the appointment of a
7 Parenting Coordinator, and the "teenage discretion" provision contained in the Stipulated Parenting Plan
8 are against public policy. .
9

10 One of the cornerstones of Kirk's public policy argument on appeal is a report from Dr. Norman
11 Roitman dated January 14, 2014 in which Dr. Roitman opined about the teenage discretion provision
12 even though he has never met the parties' children, or spoken to Vivian (they met for the first time at his
13 deposition). The district court did not request the report, and was inclined to strike it, but, as stated in the
14 district court's order, the parties' stipulated to it and Vivian's Reply brief (which attached evidence of
15 communications between Vivian's and Kirk's counsel confirming Kirk's negotiation and knowledge of
16 the effect of the language in the "teenage discretion" provision), being allowed to remain part of the
17 record. (Appellant's Appendix, Vol. VI, pages 1437-1438). Because upon appeal Kirk has placed so
18 much emphasis on the language of Dr. Roitman's January 14, 2014 report, Vivian's Fast Track
19 Response addressed why the district court was inclined to ignore that report, and gave it little or no
20 credence.
21
22

23 All of the information Vivian noted in her brief regarding Dr. Roitman's reports was supported
24 by citations to the record (including excerpts from the deposition transcripts of Dr. Roitman and Kirk),
25 and were known to the district court during its review of Dr. Roitman's January 14, 2014 report. The
26 district court previously, in an Order that Kirk has also appealed found that Dr. Roitman's initial report
27 had no evidentiary value, and that fact is important to an understanding district court did not give weight
28

1 Dr. Roitman's opinions (which are not supported by *any* citation to treatise, published work, or peer
2 reviewed study) in his second report.

3 Kirk cites "fundamental fairness" as a basis for this Court's order allowing him to file an
4 additional fast track brief on the circumstances surrounding the preparation of Dr. Roitman's report of
5 June 9, 2011. Kirk desires to provide an explanation for his actions toward Dr. Roitman, and his
6 presentation of the initial "diagnosis" of Dr. Roitman, but his request misses the point of Vivian citing
7 those issues in her Fast Track Response. Vivian's citation identified the substantial evidence supporting
8 the district court's decision to not grant weight to Dr. Roitman's January 14, 2014 opinions. Kirk's
9 eternal insistence on presenting his claims about Vivian's fitness as a parent, including justification of
10 Dr. Roitman's diagnosis and child custody recommendation (though he had never met Vivian or the
11 parties' children), is apparent in his Fast Track Statement that includes a plethora of allegations
12 unsupported by any finding of the Court. Kirk's request here is to allow him to do more of the same.

13 Kirk requests that he be permitted to file a supplemental appendix composed of "portions of
14 Kirk's opposition, countermotion, and reply papers dealing with attorney's fees." The approximately
15 attorney's fees granted to Vivian's counsel is the subject of another of Kirk's appeals (and Vivian's
16 cross-appeal) in case number 66072. This Court will be fully apprised of the role of Dr. Roitman's June
17 9, 2011 report in relations to the attorney's fees issue through that appeal. Attorney's fees (other than
18 the \$5000.00 of fees the district court awarded Vivian after Kirk's third motion on the issue teenage
19 discretion provision) are not before this Court in the appeal of custody issues.

20 ...

21 ...

22 ...

23 ...

1 Vivian requests this Court utilize the Fast Track Statement and Response to determine whether
2 there is any need for additional briefing. Vivian believes that the briefs fully frame the issues in Kirk's
3 appeal, and permit the Court to issue its rulings without further briefing.
4

5 DATED this 1st day of June, 2015.

6 RADFORD J. SMITH, CHARTERED

7 By: Garima Varshney
8 RADFORD J. SMITH, ESQ.
9 Nevada State Bar No. 002791
10 GARIMA VARSHNEY, ESQ.
11 Nevada State Bar No. 011878
12 2470 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 206
13 Henderson, Nevada 89074
14 Attorney for Respondent
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 1st day of June, 2015, I served a copy of this RESPONDENT'S
RENEWED OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO FILE REPLY TO
FAST TRACK RESPONSE, AND TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX upon all counsel of record
by mailing it by first class mail with sufficient postage prepaid to the following address:


Tom J. Standish, Esq.
Standish Law Group
1635 Village Center Circle, Suite 180
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
tjs@standishlaw.com

Edward L. Kainen, Esq.
Kainen Law Group
10091 Park Run Dr., #110
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
ed@kainenlawgroup.com

Robert L. Eisenberg, Esq.
Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg
6005 Plumas Street, Suite 300
Reno, Nevada 89519

Kirk Harrison, Esq.
1535 Sherri Lane
Boulder City Nevada 89005

DATED this 1st day of June, 2015.


GARIMA VARSHNEY, ESQ.