

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

WESLEY ALLEN LEWIS,

Appellant,

v.

MARIA DANIELA LEWIS,

Respondent.

Electronically Filed
Supreme Court Case No. 18-02016 01:02 p.m.
Dist. Court Case No. Trade-K-104-16
Tami D. Cowden
Clerk of Supreme Court

ERRATA TO REPLACEMENT OPENING BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Tami D. Cowden, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8994

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

3773 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 400 N

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Telephone No. (702) 792-3773

cowdent@gtlaw.com

Attorney for Appellant

Appellant Wesley Allen Lewis, by and through his counsel of records, Tami D. Cowden of Greenberg Traurig, LLP, submits the following errata to his Replacement Opening Brief on Appeal:

Upon review of the briefing in this matter in preparation for the oral argument scheduled for April 13, 2016, undersigned counsel discovered certain scrivener's errors in the Replacement Opening Brief. The following corrections (shown in bold and italics) are offered to clarify any resulting confusions:

- On page 3, the phrase “appeal of an a post-decree order” should have read “appeal of *a* post-decree order.”
- On page 4, in footnote 1, the sentence reading “Presumably because the Court struck the items from the record, the documents were transmitted to the Court on appeal, and are not contained within the electronic database” should have read “Presumably because the Court struck the items from the record, the documents were *not* transmitted to the Court on appeal, and are not contained within the electronic database.”
- On page 16, the sentence reading “However, specific, set sentences of imprisonment were imposed, with prospect that such sentences could be purged.” Should have read “However, specific, set sentences of imprisonment were imposed, with *no* prospect that such sentences could be purged.”

- On page 22, the sentence reading “Because the Order modifying child support was based on deficient standards, was unsupported by specific findings, and was modification, at least in part, by a desire to punish Mr. Lewis, the modification must be vacated” should have read because the Order modifying child support was based on deficient standards, was unsupported by specific findings, and was ***motivated***, at least in part, by a desire to punish Mr. Lewis, the modification must be vacated.
- On page 24, Mr. ***Lewis*** was inadvertently referred to as Mr. Kumon.
- On page 27, the sentence reading “Significantly, this admonition had been precipitated by some sort of unseemly outburst by Mr. Lewis.” Should have stated “Significantly, this admonition had ***not*** been precipitated by some sort of unseemly outburst by Mr. Lewis.”

The undersigned offers the Court her apologies for these any other typographical or grammatical errors in the brief.

Respectfully submitted this 12th day of April, 2016.

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

/s/ Tami D. Cowden

Tami D. Cowden, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8994

3773 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 400 N

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Attorney for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on April 12, 2016, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Errata to Replacement Opening Brief of Appellant** was served by via this Court's e-filing system, on counsel of record for all parties to the action below in this matter, as follows:

THE FINE & PRICE LAW GROUP
Frances Ann Fine, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 0025
8975 South Pecos Road, Suite 5
Henderson, Nevada 89074
fran@thefinelawgroup.com

/s/Andrea Lee Rosehill

An employee of Greenberg Traurig, LLP