Snell & Wilmer LAW OFFICES 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 702.764,5200	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Michael Stein, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 4760 Bradley T. Austin, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 13064 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 1100 Las Vegas, NV 89169 Telephone (702) 784-5200 Email: <u>mstein@swlaw.com</u> Attorneys for Plaintiff/Appellant Bank of Nevada, a Nevada banking corporation	Electronically Filed Sep 25 2014 09:16 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court	
	9	DISTRICT COURT		
	10	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
	 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	 BANK OF NEVADA, a Nevada banking corporation, Plaintiff, vs. MURRAY PETERSEN, an individual, Defendant. 1. APPELLANT FILING THIS CASE A Plaintiff, BANK OF NEVADA, a Nevad 2. JUDGE ISSUING THE JUDGMENT Judge Ken Cory. 3. ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDI Plaintiff: BANK OF NEVADA Defendant: MURRAY PETERSEN 4. ALL PARTIES TO THE APPEAL: 	da banking corporation. OR ORDER APPEALED FROM:	
	26 27 28	(Same as #3, above) Appellant: BANK OF NEVADA Respondent: MURRAY PETERSEN		
			Decket CCEC2 Decument 2014 219EC	

Snell & Wilmer LAW OFFICES 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100 Las Vegas, Nevada 99169	1	5. NAME OF COUNSEL AND WHOM THEY REPRESENT:	
	2	Counsel for Appellant:	
	3	Michael Stein, Esq. Bradley Austin, Esq.	
	4	SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100	
	5	Las Vegas, NV 89169 Telephone: 702-784-5200	
	6	Facsimile: 702-784-5252	
	7	Counsel for Respondent:	
	8	Richard McKnight, Esq. The McKnight Law Firm, PLLC	
	9	528 S. Casino center Blvd., #335 Las Vegas, NV 89101	
	10	Respondent was represented in the district court by the above listed attorneys, and	
	11	Appellant has reason to believe that he will also be represented by those attorneys on appeal.	
	12	6. WHETHER APPELLANT WAS REPRESENTED BY APPOINTED OR	
	13	RETAINED COUNSEL IN THE DISTRICT COURT:	
	14	Appellant was represented by retained counsel in the Eighth Judicial District Court action.	
	15	7. RETAINED COUNSEL ON APPEAL:	
	16	Appellant is represented by retained counsel, the law firm of Snell & Wilmer L.L.P., on	
	17	appeal:	
	18	Michael Stein, Esq. Bradley Austin, Esq.	
	19	SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100	
	20	Las Vegas, NV 89169 Telephone: 702-784-5200	
	21	Facsimile: 702-784-5252	
	22	8. WHETHER APPELLANT WAS GRANTED LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS, AND THE DATE OF ENTRY OF THE DISTRICT COURT ORDER	
	23	GRANTING SUCH LEAVE:	
	24	Appellant has not moved for leave to file an appeal in forma pauperis.	
	25	9. INDICATE THE DATE THE PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED IN THE DISTRICT COURT:	
	26	The Complaint in this matter (A-12-660649-C) was filed with the Eighth Judicial District	
	27	Court on April 12, 2013.	
	28	- 2 -	
		- 2 -	
		n	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

28

10.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE OF THE ACTION AND RESULT:

This is a breach of guaranty action in which Appellant Bank of Nevada sought a judgment against Respondent Petersen under NRS 40.495. Bank of Nevada loaned Red Card, LLC ("Red Card") over \$2.5 million dollars to repay a loan previously made by Bank of Nevada to Red Card.

Mr. Petersen personally guaranteed Red Card's repayment of the debt. Red Card defaulted on the loan, which was secured by certain real property. The fair market value of the property was less than the amount of Red Card's indebtedness to Plaintiff. Accordingly, Plaintiff now seeks a judgment against Petersen. The loan was evidenced by two separate promissory notes - Note A in the principal amount of \$1,444,898 and Note B in the principal amount of \$1,092,591. Red Card executed two Deeds of Trust, which were recorded in the Clark County Recorder's office. Both deeds of trust encumbered the land commonly known as 8490 Westcliff Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 (the "*Property*").

Red Card and Petersen, as Guarantor, failed to make the monthly payments due under Note A and Note B constituting an Event of Default. The Property was sold via trustee's sale with Bank of Nevada purchasing the Property. Bank of Nevada and Petersen subsequently stipulated that for the purposes of a deficiency calculation, the fair market value of the Property, as of the commencement date of the action, was \$1,900,000.

In ruling on Bank of Nevada's Motion for Summary Judgment and Mr. Petersen's
Countermotion for Summary Judgment, the District Court found that NRS 40.455(1) applies in
guarantor deficiency actions and that Bank of Nevada did not file an application within six
months of the trustee's sale under NRS 40.455(1). Based on these findings, the District Court
granted Mr. Petersen's Countermotion for Summary Judgment.

Bank of Nevada filed a Rule 59(e) Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment, arguing that (1) because there were two promissory notes, NRS 40.455 did not apply to Bank of Nevada in its capacity as a junior lienholder; (2) by waiving the one action rule, Mr. Petersen waived the right to invoke NRS 40.455; and (3) the District Court misinterpreted the work "application" in its ruling. At the invitation of the Court, Bank of Nevada filed a Supplemental Brief Regarding *Lavi*

- 3 -

Snell & Wilmer LAW DEFICES LAW OFFICES Law Vegas, Nevada 89169 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

v. Eighth Judicial District Court, arguing that Lavi does not control the outcome of the instant 1 case because Lavi dealt solely with the application of NRS 40.455 to first deed of trust holders 2 suing guarantors in deficiency actions, whereas Bank of Nevada was also suing in its capacity as 3 a junior lienholder. The District Court ultimately denied Bank of Nevada's Rule 59(e) Motion to 4 Alter or Amend Judgment. This appeal challenges (1) the District Court's Order Denying 5 Plaintiffs Motion for Summary Judgment and Order Granting Defendant's Countermotion for 6 Summary Judgment, entered on May 8, 2014; (2) the District Court's Findings of Fact and 7 Conclusions of Law, entered on May 8, 2014; (3) and the District Court's Order Denying 8 Plaintiff's Rule 59(e) Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment, entered on September 17, 2014. 9

10 || 11. **PREVIOUS APPEAL OR WRIT PROCEEDING:**

The case has not previously been the subject of an appeal or writ proceedings in the Supreme Court.

12. CHILD CUSTODY:

This appeal does not involve child custody or visitation.

13. **POSSIBILITY OF SETTLEMENT:**

Appellant Bank of Nevada believes there is a possibility of settlement. The Nevada Supreme Court's decision on this case creates an all or nothing scenario for each party.

Dated: September \underline{A} , 2014.

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

By:

Michael Stein, Esq. (Nevada Bar. No. 4760) Bradley T. Austin, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 13064) 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100 Las Vegas, NV 89169

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Appellant

, Suite 1100 169 Snell & Wilmer 3883 Howard Las V

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

