1	1	
2	2 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TH	HE STATE OF NEVADA
3	3	
4	WILLIAM POREMBA)	Electronically Filed Mar 27 2015 08:59 a.m.
5	Petitioner,	Tracie K. Lindeman e No.: 66888Clerk of Supreme Court
6	· II	e No.: 668880 leth of Supreme Court
7	7 COLUMNEYADA DAVING.	
8	S&C CLAIMS SERVICE and	
9	9 APPEALS OFFICER,)	
10	0 Respondent.	
11	1	
12	2	
13	APPENDI	X
14	VOLUME I	X
15	MATTHEW S. DUNKLEY, ESQ.	
	6 Nevada Bar No. 6627 MARK G. LOSEE, ESQ.	
	Nevada Bar No. 12996	
18	8 DUNKLEY LAW 2450 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 210	
	9 Henderson, Nevada 89074 Telephone: (702) 413-6565	
	0 Facsimile: (702) 570-5940	
21	1 Attorneys for Appellant William Poremba	
22	2	
23	3	
24	4	
25	5	
26		
27	7	
28		

1	APPENDIX TO APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF	2
2	TITLE	PAGE NO.
3	Request for Hearing - Contested Claim	APP001-002
4	Order Transferring Hearing to Appeals Office	APP003
5	Notice of Appeal and Order to Appear	APP004-005
6	Insurer's Motion for Summary Judgment	APP006-012
7	Insurer's Index of Documents	APP013-142
8	Claimant's Opposition to Insurer's Motion for Summary Judgment	APP143-184
9	Insurer's Reply Brief in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment	APP185-190
10	Order Denying Insurer's Motion for Summary Judgment	APP191-192
11	Insurer's Appeal Memorandum	APP193-200
12	Notice of Resetting	APP201-202
13	Insurer's Supplemental Index of Documents	APP203-297
14	Order Granting Insurer's Motion for Summary Judgment	APP298-299
15	Transcript of Proceedings, January 29, 2014	APP300-361
16	Petition for Review	APP362-367
17	Transmittal of Record of Appeal	APP368-374
	Petitioners Opening Brief	APP375-388
18	Certificate of Service (Re: Petitioners Opening Brief)	APP389-390
19 20	Respondents S&C Claims Service, Inc., and Southern Nevada Paving's Answering Brief	APP391-411
21	Petitioners Reply Brief	APP412-425
22	Request for Hearing	APP426-427
23	Certificate of Mailing (Re: Request for Hearing)	APP428-429
24	Court Minutes Re: Petition for Judicial Review	APP430
25	Order Denying Petitioner's Petition for Judicial Review	APP431-433
26		
27		

Z:\Files Open\260710 Poremba vs SNP (WC)\AppealSupremeCt\Appendik.wpd

Electronically Filed 08/27/2014 09:36:15 AM

				00/21/2014 0	
1 2 3 4 5	CERT MATTHEW S. DUNKLEY, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 6627 MARK G. LOSEE, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 12996 DUNKLEY LAW 2450 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 210 Henderson, Nevada 89074 Tel. (702) 413-6565 Fax (702) 570-5940 Attorneys for Plaintiff			CLERK OF TH	
8	DISTR	ICT COU	RT		
10	CLARK CO	JUNTY. N	EVADA		
11)	D (IIDII		
12	WILLIAM POREMBA)) CA	SE NO. : A	-14-698184	
13	Petitioner, vs.) DE	PT NO. : II		
)			
14	SOUTHERN NEVADA PAVING; S&C CLAIMS SERVICE and)			
15	DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, APPEALS OFFICER,)			
16)			
17	Respondent.)			
18	CERTIFICA	ATE OF M	IAILING		
20	I certify that on this 27 th day of Augu	ust, 2014, t	he foregoing	REQUEST FO	OR HEARING
21	was served on the following by depositing a	a true copy	of the same	e for mailing,	first class mai
22	addressed as follows:	13		5,	
23	addressed as follows.				
24					
25	Alyssa M. Fischer, Esq. Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP				
26	2300 w. Sahara Avenue, Suite 300, Box 28 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102	٩			
27	1//				
28					
		1			

1 2	Southern Nevada Paving 3101 E. Craig Road N. Las Vegas, Nevada 89030	
3	Julie Wood	
4	S&C Claims Service 9075 W. Diablo Drive, # 140	
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89148	
6	Department of Administration	
7	Hearings Division-Appeals Office Appeals Officer Shirley D. Lindsey, Esq.	
8	2200 South Rancho Drive, Suite 220 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102	
9		Λ
10		1 Hou
11		An Employee of Dunkley Law
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Civil Petition for Judicial COURT MINUTES

Review

A-14-698184-J William Poremba, Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Southern Nevada Paving, Defendant(s)

September 29, 2014

3:00 AM

Petition for Judicial Review

HEARD BY: Vega, Valorie J.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 16B

COURT CLERK: Nora Pena

PARTIES |

None

PRESENT:

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- COURT ORDERED, Petition for Judicial Review DENIED and thereby AFFIRMS the DECISION below pursuant to NRS 233B.135 as the Court does not find any violation of law, excess of authority, unlawful procedure, error of law, clear error upon review of the record, nor that the decision was arbitrary, or capricious, or characterized by abuse of discretion. Ms. Fischer to prepare the order.

PRINT DATE: 09/29/2014

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

September 29, 2014

Electronically Filed 10/22/2014 02:36:59 PM

ORDD ì DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. 2 Nevada Bar No. 005125 CLERK OF THE COURT LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP 3 2300 W. Sahara Ave., Ste. 300, Box 28 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 4 Telephone: 702/893-3383 5 Facsimile: 702/366-9689 Email: daniel.schwartz@lewisbrisbois.com 6 Attorneys for Respondents S&C CLAIMS SERVICES, INC. and 7 SOUTHERN NEVADA PAVING 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 WILLIAM POREMBA, Case No.: A-14-698184-J 11 Petitioner, Dept. No.: II 12 VS. 13 SOUTHERN NEVADA PAVING; S&C CLAIMS SERVICES, INC.; AND **NEVADA** 14 DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION. APPEALS OFFICER 15 16 Respondents. 17 ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW 18 TO: WILLIAM POREMBA, Petitioner; and 19 MATTHEW DUNKLEY, ESQ. and MARK LOSEE, ESQ. Petitioner's Attorneys of TO: 20 Record. 21 The above-captioned matter came before the Honorable Valorie J. Vega on 22 September 29, 2014, on the Petitioner, WILLIAM POREMBA's Petition for Judicial Review 23 relative to the Appeal Officer's Order Granting Summary Judgment against him related to a request 24 for reopening, in a contested workers' compensation claim. The Court, having reviewed the record 25 and considered the arguments of the parties, finds that the Petitioner's Petition for Judicial Review is 26 DENIED. 27 28 When this Court reviews an Administrative decision, it is to give deference to the 4852-1789-5455.1 J visins by Dispress 30833-117 X Control Subjects
Control Subjects
Controls
Control
Contr Distribution Courses O Myselened (Survey) Orlay's loggment Citivities to Dismiss by Design

BISGAARD & SVID-LUP

Dadpinen et Arbitestie

16 17

19

21 22

24 25

26 27

28

agency's determination of facts. Roberts v. State Indus. Ins. System, 114 Nev. 364, 367, 956 P.2d 790, 792 (1998). The reviewing Court is not to substitute its view of the case so long as the Appeals Officer's decision does not contain an error of law or is clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative and substantial evidence, and therefore, based upon the whole record was not arbitrary, capricious or characterized by an abuse of discretion. NRS 233B.135(3).

Here, the claimant appealed from the denial of reopening of his workers' compensation claim. Claimant failed to submit any medical evidence in support of his request for reopening. Further, claimant failed to prove that he exhausted his third-party proceeds on medical treatment before asking the Insurer to pay additional benefits under the workers' compensation claim. The Insurer denied claimant's request for reopening and the claimant appealed. The parties bypassed the Hearing Officer. The Insurer filed a Motion for Summary Judgment, which the Appeals Officer initially denied and a hearing commenced.

At the Appeals Officer hearing, the Claimant testified that he spent the third-party settlement sum of \$34,631.51 on paying his mortgage, supporting his family, and on food. The Claimant admitted that he did no spend the \$34,631.51 on medical care that would be the responsibility of the workers' compensation Insurer if the claim was reopened.

The Insurer argued (1) that the Claimant has not proven that he has exhausted his offset because he has not proven that he spent his third-party proceeds on medical care incurred after the date of settlement; and (2) even if we could reach the issue of reopening, the Claimant has insufficient medical evidence to prove the need for more treatment on an industrial basis.

Appeals Officer Shirley Lindsey issued an Order Granting the Insurer's Motion for Summary Judgment, in lieu of a Decision and Order with Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

111

///

4852-1789-5455.1 30833-117

1 2 3	Order Denying Petition for Judicial Review Petitioner: William Poremba Case No.: A-14-698184-J Dept. No.: II
4	THE COURT FINDS, that the there was no violation of law, excess of authority,
5	unlawful procedure, error of law, nor clear error upon review of the record. The Appeal's Officer's
6	granting of Insurer's Motion for Summary Judgment was based upon substantial evidence and,
7	
8 9	therefore, was not arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion. Therefore, COURT ORDERED, Petition for Judicial Review is DENIED.
10	
11	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that
12	Petitioner WILLIAM POREMBA's Petition for Judicial Review is DENIED.
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.
13	DATED this gay of October, 2014.
15	11/10/20
16	MIRCLA
17	VALORIE J. VEGA DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
18	Submitted by:
19	LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
20	
21	By All War for
22	DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESO.
23	Nevada Bar No. 5125 2300 W. Sahara Ave., Ste. 300, Box 28
24	Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Attorneys for the Respondents
25	S&C CLAIMS and SOUTHERN NEVADA PAVING
26	
27	
28	
	4852-1789-5455.1

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

30833-117

3