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IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

STATE OF NEVADA
Plaintiff,
vs.
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant.
:

REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR MOTION TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT ENTERED PURSUANT TO NRCP 60(B)

COMES NOW, RICHARD JUSTIN, Justin Bros Bail Bonds (hereinafter "Justin"), Real Party in Interest, as Agent for International Fidelity Insurance Company, by and through undersigned counsel, and hereby submits his Reply in Support of Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's Order entered October 3, 2014 denying Exoneration of the above-referenced bond; and/or Motion to Set Aside Judgment entered on October 6, 2014.

Dated this 7 day of December, 2014.


RICHARD A. MOLEZZO, ESQ.
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## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. HISTORY

Undersigned counsel will not repeat the background of this case except for restating that September 18, 2014, Deputy District Attorney Terrance Shea filed his Response to Motion for Exoneration of Bond stating in pertinent part, "...the State has no objection to the motion for exoneration of bond." (Response; p.2, Line 7). The Deputy District Attorney agreed with Justin regarding exoneration of the bond and this Court should take notice of Mr. Shea's non opposition and exonerate the bond.

Furthermore, on October 23, 2014, undersigned counsel filed his motion for reconsideration and/or motion to set aside judgment entered pursuant to NRCP 60(b). Mr. Shea was personally served with the Motion on the same day, and to date has not filed any opposition to said motion. It is believed Mr. Shea has not filed any opposition because he agrees that the bond, by operation of law should have been exonerated once the defendant was remanded into custody on January 31, 2014.

The Nevada Supreme Court has been very clear on this issue stating in pertinent part, "...the first great object of the courts ... [is] to place such construction upon them as will carry out the manifest purpose of the legislature...." Thomas v. State, 88 Nev. 382, 384, 498 P.2d 1314, 1315 (1972).

And
In Harris v. State, 104 Nev .46 (1988), the statutes "...shall be strictly construed...".
In the instant case, strictly construing NRS 178.509(1)(4), January 31, 2014 is the proper date of the exoneration of the bond in question. Defendant was remanded into the Custody of the Washoe County Sheriff's Department. This Statute governs and is the Statute that Justin relies upon the Court adhering to. On that date his obligation and duties to this Court ended.

February 3, 2014 Bona Fide Bail Bonds bailed defendant out of jail, which is when Bona Fide became the new guarantor in this Case. Justin's Bond must be exonerated.

## II. LEGAL AUTHORITY

Pursuant to NRS $178.509(1)(4)$ is written in pertinent part,
"1. If the defendant fails to appear when the defendant's presence in court is lawfully required, the court shall not exonerate the surety before the date of forfeiture prescribed in NRS 178.508 unless:
(4.) Is being detained by civil...authorities..." (emphasis added) NRS 178.509(1)(4).

There can be no question or ambiguity regarding this matter. The Statute is clear. Strictly construing this statute, January 31,2014 , defendant was being detained by "civil authorities" the Washoe County Sheriff's Department. This ended Justin's obligations to this Court on the bond in question.

Furthermore, pursuant to NRS $178.508(1)$ (b), is written in pertinent part,
"1. If the defendant fails to appear when the defendant's presence in court is lawfully required...the court shall:
(b) Not later than 45 days after the date on which the defendant failed to appear, order the issuance of a warrant for the arrest of the defendant..."

In the instant case, adherence to the specified statutory authority is essential to effectuating the legislature's enactment of a 'bright line' rule. Not to properly interpret a statute such as Chapter 178, goes against every Nevada Supreme Court Case authority and undermines the authority of the Supreme Court.

The Nevada Supreme Court in International Fidelity Insurance v. State, 122 Nev .39 . 126 P.3d 1133 (Nev. 2006), has opined "In a district court's decision in a bail bond proceeding is typically based on factual determinations made by the district court, and the reviewing court will not disturb a district court's findings of fact unless they are clearly erroneous and not based on substantial evidence." (emphasis added). Not exonerating Justin's bond on or after January 31 ,

2014 is clearly erroneous; therefore, this Honorable Court must grant the exoneration.
Furthermore, the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant was not entered into the system until after the June 10, 2014 hearing well past the 45 day requirement; not as the docket reflects that it was entered on March 21, 2014.: The docket does have an entry that on June 10, 2014, the "... $\$ 10,000$ cash only warrant, will not issue..." due to the clerical error discovered that the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant was not entered. The Court should take judicial notice of this particular entry as it parallels Justin's position in this case.

Surely this Honorable Court can see the problems that arise out of this situation. Defendant was allowed to bail out of jail on a $\$ 20,000$ bond in May 2014, instead of being held by the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant. No person or entity was aware of the cash only warrant from Justin to the Sheriff's department. Clearly this is an erroneous clerical error, and not the fault of Justin.

To forfeit the bond in question is paramount to punishing Justin for something he had no control over, which in essence, goes against the very grain of our criminal justice system in place today. Justin did not know nor could have known that Defendant was remanded into custody on the January 31,2014 . He was never notified by anyone. Certainly this Court does not expect Justin to follow every single defendant that he provides a bond for, or track every single defendant's court dates or apply for exonerations, when that exoneration should have been performed by operation of law. Justin was under the belief that the bond in question was to be exonerated, now imagine his surprise when he received the Notice of Intent to Forfeit.

Notwithstanding the above, even if the bond was not exonerated on or after January 31 , 2014, it must have been exonerated when Bona Fide Bail Bonds wrote Bond \#2, securing the release of the Defendant February 3, 2014. No two bond agents or companies shall have a bond
written on the same person, under the same case, for the same charges. This directly controveris the bond companies' insurance statutes. Therefore, the bond must be exonerated based upon the above in its entirety.

Finally, the Defendant has since been remanded back into custody as he was surrendered by Justin's Nevada Bail Enforcement Agent, Doug Lewis. Mr. Lewis surrendered him on Justin's second bond of $\$ 20,000$, all within the statutory 180 day time limit; therefore, that bond must also be exonerated by operation of law and Justin surely does not have to file any motion to request the $2^{\text {nd }}$ bond be exonerated, it should automatically happen.

WHEREFORE, Justin prays that this Honorable Court grant his Motion in its entirety and for any further relief this Court deems just and proper in the premises.

Dated this day of December, 2014.


RICHARD A. MOLEZZO, ESQ.
Attorney for Richard Justin et.al.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that the foregoing document in the above entitled case was served on this $\qquad$ day of December, 2014 on all parties to this action by:
placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing in the United States Mail, at Reno, Nevada, postage paid, following ordinary business practices.
personal delivery
Facsimile (FAX)
Federal Express or other overnight delivery
Messenger Service
Certified Mail with Return Receipt Requested.
addressed as follows:
Deputy District Attorney Terrance Shea
Washoe County District Attorney
1 South Sierra Street, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Reno; NV
AFFIRMATION: The undersigned hereby affirms that this document does not contain any social security numbers of any person Pursuant to NRS 239B.030.

DATED this $\mathcal{H}$ day of December 2014.
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# IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 

 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOETHE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
vs.

NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant.

Case No. CR14-0058
Dept. No. 1

## ***

## ORDER

On August 22, 2014, Richard Justin (Justin), dba Justin Bros Bail Bonds, Real Party in Interest and agent acting on behalf of International Fidelity Insurance Company, by and through Counsel, Richard Molezzo, Esq., filed a Motion for Exoneration of Bond pursuant to NRS 176A.330. On October 3, 2014, the Court entered an Order denying Justin's Motion because the Defendant had not appeared before the Court since January 30, 2014.

On October 23, 2014, Justin filed a Motion for Reconsideration. On December 8, 2014, Justin filed a Reply and submitted the matter for the Cout's decision.

Pursuant to WDCR 12(8), a party must file its motion for reconsideration within ten days after the date the order for which the party seeks reconsideration is filed. "A district court may reconsider a previously decided issue if substantially different evidence is subsequently introduced or the decision is clearly erroneous." Masonry \& Tile Contractors Ass'n of S. Nev. v. Jolley, Urga \& Wirth, Ltd., 113 Nev. 737, 741, 941 P.2d 486, 489 (1997) (citation omitted). "Only in very rare
instances in which new issues of fact or law are raised supporting a ruling contrary to the ruling already reached should a motion for rehearing [or reconsideration] be granted." Moore v. City of Las Vegas, 92 Nev. 402, 405, 551 P. $2 \mathrm{~d} 244,246$ (1976) (emphasis added).

The Court has considered the motion and other papers in their entirety. The Court finds Justin has not presented substantially different evidence or persuasive legal authority, nor has she demonstrated that the Court's decision was clearly erroneous. Accordingly, and good cause appearing, Justin's Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED this 230 day of December 2014.


District Judge
-2-

## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

I hereby certify that I an an employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe; that on this $23^{n d}$ day of December, 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following:

Zack Young/Travis Lucia, Deputies District Attorney
Washoe County District Attorney's Office

Carl Hylin/Donald White, Deputies Public Defender
Washoe County Public Defender's Office

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, County of Washoc; that on this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2014, I deposited in the County mailing system for postage and mailing with the United States Postal Service in Reno, Nevada, a true copy of the attached document addressed to:

Richard Molezzo Esq.
96 Winder Street
Reno, NV 89503
for Maria od Shuck
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Code: 2490
Richard F. Cornell, Esq.
150 Ridge Street, Second Floor
Reno, NV 89501
(775) 329-1141

State Bar \#1553
Attorney for Plaintiff
IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,
vs.
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE
Defendant.

MOTION TO DECLARE JUDGMENT OF OCTOBER 6, 2014 UNENFORCEABLE AND/OR COMPLETELY SATISFIED, AND TO EXONERATE BAIL BOND NO. 1S30K-151744

COMES NOW, Richard Justin dba Justin Bros. Bail Bonds and International Fidelity Insurance Company, by and through the undersigned counsel, and hereby files his Motion to Declare the forfeiture judgment of October 2, 2014 to be unenforceable or, in the alternative, satisfied; and to exonerate International Fidelity Insurance Company bond no. 1S30K-151744 in the amount
of $\$ 25,000.00$, issued in consideration of the release of Norman Demetrius Dupree in or about November of 2013.

The within Motion is based upon all matters on file, together with the attached Affidavit of Richard Justin and exhibits thereto.

DATED this $\left\lfloor^{\prime}\right\rceil$ day of February, 2015.
Respectfully submitted,
LAW OFFICES OF RICHARD F. CORNELL 150 Ridge Street, Second Floor Reno, NV 89501


## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## A. FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES UP TO OCTOBER 23,2014

The Court is already aware of the following facts, from the Motion for Exoneration of Bond filed on August 22, 2014 and the Motion for Reconsideration and/or Motion to Set Aside Judgment entered pursuant to NRCP 60(b), filed on October 23,2014:

1. On November 6, 2013, one Norman Demetrius Dupree was arrested and charged either with domestic battery by strangulation or sale of a schedule one or
schedule two controlled substance, second offense. He was also charged with a first domestic battery offense. His total bail originally was $\$ 25,000.00$, of which $\$ 5,000.00$ was attributed to the misdemeanor charge and the remaining $\$ 20,000.00$ to the felony charge. Justin Bros., on behalf of International Fidelity Insurance Company, posted the requisite bail in the amount of $\$ 25,000.00$ in the form of bond no. 1S30K-151744, and Dupree was released from custody.
2. While Reno Justice Court had jurisdiction over the matter, that Court placed Dupree on a supervised condition of bail. On January 31, 2014 Dupree's supervised bail was revoked due to failure to comply (a dirty urine test). At that point Dupree was remanded to the Washoe County Jail.

As noted below, at that point the $\$ 25,000.00$ bail bond posted as above referenced should have been exonerated by operation of law, regardless of whether this Court had seen him in open court or not. However, the bond was not exonerated.
3. After Dupree was remanded, bail was reset in the amount $\$ 20,000.00$ bondable. Bonafide Bail Bonds, not affiliated with either with Justin Bros. or International Fidelity Insurance Company, posted bail for Dupree on that bond, and Dupree was released from custody for a second time on the same charges).
4. On March 18, 2014, Dupree failed to appear at the scheduled
arraignment. The court issued a Notice of Intent to forfeit the bond and sent it both to Justin Bros. and Bonafide Bail Bonds, with a $\$ 50,000.00$ cash only warrant issuing per the Notice.
5. On March 21, 2014, Dupree attempted to surrender himself three times at the Washoe County Sheriff's Department, but to no avail because the sheriff did not have the warrant in its system.
6. Dupree then turned himself in to Bonafide Bail Bonds' recovery agent, who surrendered him to the custody of the sheriff. Thus, Bonafide's bond was exonerated on May 14, 2014. However, for reasons unknown to Justin Bros. and the surety, the $\$ 25,000.00$ bond in question was not.
7. As of May 14-16, 2014 the $\$ 50,000.00$ cash only warrant had not been filed with an agency, and thus the Sheriff's Office consequently was not aware of the "cash only" condition. On May 16, 2014, Justin Bros. posted a $\$ 20,000.00$ bond on behalf of Dupree, not being aware of the " $\$ 50,000.00$ cash only" requirement. The sheriff erroneously released Dupree for a third time on the same charge (s), since it did not have the " $\$ 50,000.00$ cash only warrant" in its system even as of that date.
8. On May 27, 2014 the Court set a status hearing or arraignment for June 10,2014. Dupree again failed to appear, and the Court again sent a Notice of

Intent to forfeit the bond of $\$ 20,000.00$ to Justin Bros.. However, the first bond of $\$ 25,000.00$ and the one that is subject to this Motion was still in forfeiture status at that point, insofar as the Court was concerned, even though for reasons stated below it should have been exonerated by operation of law on the Court's own motion.
9. Justin Bros. thus made contact with Dupree and arranged for Dupree to turn himself in to custody. Dupree did so. Even so, this Court did not exonerate the $\$ 25,000.00$ bond in question.
10. When all of this happened, Justin Bros. filed a Motion to Exonerate Bond on August 22, 2014, approximately five months after this Court had filed its Notice of Intent to Forfeit to International Fidelity Insurance Company. In response, the State filed a non-opposition to the Motion on September 18, 2014 wherein the State simply stated:
"Assuming for the purposes of this Motion only the truth of the matter asserted by the bondsman, and reserving all objections of any kind to the same and any future filings, the State has no objection to the Motion for Exoneration of Bond."
11. Notwithstanding all of that, on October 3, 2014 this Court entered its Order Denying the Motion for Exoneration of Bond. This Court's reasoning appeared to be: 1) Justin Bros. did not properly seek to surrender the $\$ 25,000.00$
bond as soon as it could have; 2) Justin Bros. failed to surrender Dupree to the proper authorities, thereby preventing the exoneration of the bond; 3) Dupree had not been arraigned by the Court and, to the Court's acknowledge, remained out of custody. Thus, the Court entered its "bail forfeiture judgment" on October 6, 2014 in favor of the State of Nevada and against International Fidelity Insurance Company in the amount of $\$ 25,000.00$.
12. On October 23, 2014, Justin Bros. filed a Motion for Reconsideration and/or a Motion to Set Aside Judgment Pursuant to NRCP 60(b). There, Justin Bros. pointed out that under these facts the $\$ 25,000.00$ bond was exonerated as a matter of law, once pre-trial services revoked Dupree's release and he was remanded to custody; and he pointed another case with an identical factual scenario in Washoe County where that actually happened. Accordingly, the "surrender" of the bond was unnecessary; it was exonerated by operation of law. He further argued that because of the mistake of the Sheriff's Office and not putting the $\$ 50,000.00$ cash only warrant into the system, Justin Bros. was in the position of bailing Dupree out on the $\$ 20,000.00$ bond, which should not have happened. Petitioner argued that he should not be punished because of the mistake.

The State again did not oppose the Motion. However, on December 23,

2014 this Court denied the unopposed Motion for Reconsideration on the grounds that Justin Bros. had not presented "substantially different evidence" of "persuasive legal authority."

## B. FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OCCURRING SINCE OCTOBER 23, 2014

13. Unfortunately, Justin Bros. did not point this out until the Reply to the non-opposition, which technically was unnecessary. He pointed out that Dupree was now in the custody of the Washoe County Jail as of December 8, 2014, as Justin's enforcement agent had surrendered Dupree on the second $\$ 20,000.00$ bond, IS30K-162345, all within the statutory 180 -day time limit. So that there can be no mistake whatsoever on this critical factual point, Justin Bros. attaches proof of the same with respect to the Affidavit of Richard Justin.
14. Per the docket sheet in this case, on December 9, 2014, Mr. Dupree pled guilty at his arraignment, and Judge Flanagan sentenced Dupree on February 5, 2015.
15. Justin Bros. filed a Notice of Appeal from the Court's decision.

However, after the undersigned was retained and appeared, the Nevada Supreme Court entered an Order to Show Cause on February 2, 2015, directing Justin Bros. to show cause why their appeal should not be dismissed for lack of appellate
jurisdiction. Indeed, per International Fidelity Insurance Co. v. State, 122 Nev . 39, 126 P.3d 1133 (2006), the Nevada Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction to review orders in ancillary bail bond proceedings on direct appeal. The appropriate vehicle for review of orders in ancillary bail bond proceedings is by Petition for Mandamus. The undersigned's response is that while the Court can treat an appeal as a Petition for Mandamus, the better course would be to allow Justin Bros. to file and litigate this Motion, based upon facts that the Court may not have been aware of in December of 2014; and only if this Court continues to mandate forfeiture should the appeal become reflied as a Petition for Mandamus.

## C. ARGUMENT

The relevant statutes to consider are as follows:

NRS 178.509(1)(a) provides:
"If the defendant fails to appear when the defendant's presence in court is lawfully required, the court shall not exonerate the surety before the date of forfeiture prescribed in NRS 178.508 unless:

The defendant appears before the court and the court, upon hearing the matter, determine that the defendant has presented a satisfactory excuse or that the surety did not in any way cause or aid the absence of the defendant; or....."

NRS 178.512 provides:
"1. The court shall not set aside a forfeiture unless:
> a) the surety submits an application to set it aside on the ground that the defendant:

1) has appeared before the court since the date of the forfeiture and has presented a satisfactory excuse for the defendant's absence ...; and
b) the court determines that justice does require the enforcement of the forfeiture."

NR 178.514 provides:
" 1 . When a forfeiture has not been set aside, the court shall on motion enter a judgment of default and execution may issue thereon.
2. If the Office of Court Administrator has not received an order setting aside a forfeiture within 180 days after the issuance of the order of forfeiture, the Court Administrator shall request that the court that ordered the forfeiture institute proceedings to enter a judgment of default with respect to the amount of the undertaking or money deposited instead of bail bond with the court. Not later than 30 days after receipt of the request from the Office of Court Administrator, the court shall enter judgment by default and commence execution proceedings thereon."

NRS 178.522 provides:
"1. When the condition of the bond has been satisfied or the forfeiture thereof has been set aside or remitted, the court shall exonerate the obligor and release any bail. The court shall exonerate the obligors and release any bail at the time of sentencing of the defendant, if the court has not previously done so unless the money deposited by the defendant as bail must be applied to satisfy a judgment pursuant to NRS 178.528.
2. A surety may be exonerated by a deposit of cash in the amount of the bond or by a timely surrender of the defendant into custody.

NRS 178.526 provides:
" 1 . For the purpose of surrendering a defendant, a surety, at any time before the surety is finally discharged, and at any place within the state, may, by:
a) written authorization for the rest of the defendant attached to a copy of the undertaking; or
b) a written authority endorsed on a certified copy of the undertaking, cause the defendant to be arrested by a bail agent or bail enforcement agent who is licensed pursuant to Chapter 697 of NRS."

Based upon these statutes, the only legal conclusions that can be reached are as follows:

1. When Dupree was remanded into custody in January of 2014, bail bond no. 1S30K-151744 was exonerated by operation of law; but additionally
2. When Dupree was remanded into custody after bailing out on the Bonafide Bail Bonds bond, the within International Fidelity Insurance bond should have been exonerated as a matter of law; but additionally
3. When Dupree turned himself in to be surrendered in March of 2014, the bond should have exonerated as a matter of law; but additionally
4. When Justin Bros.' bail enforcement agent caused Dupree to be remanded into custody within 180 days of the Notice of Intent to Forfeit on Bond IS30K-162345, and when Dupree thereafter plead guilty while in custody and sentenced while in custody, both bail bonds absolutely, positively, unequivocally, unquestionably, and undeniably had to be exonerated as a matter of law.

When a defendant is remanded to custody of the sheriff, the bail bond previously posted is exonerated by operation of law. The Court may not continue the surety's liability on the previously posted bond at that point. People v . International Fidelity Insurance Co., 138 Cal. Rptr.3d 883, 887 (Cal. App. 2012), and cases cited therein. Thus, the trial court cannot use the old bond, which should have been exonerated as the matter of law, to act as additional security for a subsequently ordered bail bond. When the Court does so, the new bond is void and is subject to attack at any time. (Id. at 888)

The reason exoneration happens by operation of law in that instance is that the responsibilities of the surety are based upon its constructive custody of the person bailed. But once that person has been remanded into formal custody, the surety cannot any longer have custody over the accused. Kiperman v. Klenshetyn, 35 Cal. Rptr.3d 178, 182 (Cal. App. 2005), and cases cited therein.

An exception to this rule may exist where the accused is returned to custody in a county where the case was not filed. In that instance, exoneration does not occur by operation of law; the bondsman must file a timely motion. But in the case where the defendant is returned to custody in the jurisdiction where his case is filed, the court must act on its own motion to exonerate the bond, and if it fails to do so exoneration is accomplished by operation of law. People $v$. Accredited

Surety \& Casualty Co., 138 Cal. Rptr.3d 370, 375 (Cal. App. 2012), and cases cited therein.

When a defendant appears in court, a prior order forfeiting bail is not merely erroneous. It is void. People v. Safety National Casualty Corp., 57 Cal. Rptr.3d 659, 660-62 (Cal. App. 2007). ${ }^{1}$

In a case where the statute is not self-executing (as here), nevertheless a bail bond is exonerated by operation of law at the moment the defendant appears and is convicted. The trial court cannot lawfully bind a surety to a bail bond when the accused has been convicted. State v. French, 945 P.2d 752, 756-57 (Wash. App. 1997). Once the defendant appears and is sentenced, what happens afterwards is simply irrelevant; the bond is exonerated as a matter of law. People v. King Bail Bond Agency, 274 Cal. Rptr. 335, 337-38 (Cal. App. 1990).

Finally, exoneration of bail bond surety normally occurs on the return of the defendant to custody. "Custody" means that the defendant reasonably believes he is physically deprived of freedom of action in any significant way - that is, he

[^0]knows he is being transferred to the control of the sheriff. See: People v . Lexington National Insurance Co., 54 Cal. Rptr.3d 900, 904-06 (Cal. App. 2007).

All of these authorities unquestionably inform the Court's exercise of discretion: Refuse to enforce the judgment of October 6, 2014, set aside the forfeiture, and declare the bond exonerated as a matter of law. There is a reason the State has not opposed this: There is no other lawful discretion for this Court to exercise. If it was not apparent before that, it certainly is apparent now: Dupree has been remanded into custody within 180 days of the Notice of Intent to Forfeit; has plead guilty while in custody; and has been sentenced while in custody. This Motion simply has to be granted.

DATED this 17 day of February, 2015.
Respectfully submitted,
LAW OFFICES OF RICHARD F. CORNELL 150 Ridge Street, Second Floor Reno, NV 89501


Code: 1075
Richard F. Cornell, Esq.
150 Ridge Street, Second Floor
Reno, NV 89501
(775) 329-1141

State Bar \#1553
Attorney for Plaintiff
IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF
NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
Case No.: CR14-0058
vs.
Dept. No.: 1
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE
Defendant.

## AFFIDAVIT OF RICHARD JUSTIN

STATE OF NEVADA ) ):ss
COUNTY OF WASHOE)
RICHARD JUSTIN, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. That your Affiant is the principal of Justin Bros. Bail Bonds. Justin Bros. Bail Bonds does business in northern Nevada. Justin Bros.' surety is International Fidelity Insurance Company, and Justin Bros. is an agent for that
surety.
2. Your Affiant makes this Affidavit in support your Affiant's and International Fidelity's Motion to Declare Judgment of October 6, 2014 unenforceable and/or completely satisfied, and to exonerate bail bond no. 1 S 30 K 151744.
3. That attached hereto as Exhibit " 1 " is the paperwork kept and maintained in the ordinary course of Justin Bros.' business, revealing the surrender of Norman Demetrius Dupree by our bail enforcement agents to the Washoe County Jail on November 6, 2014 relative to bail bone IS30K-162345.
4. That attached hereto as Exhibit " 2 " is a document that your Affiant obtained and printed off his computer from the Washoe County Jail website on or about February 4, 2015. That document reveals that Mr. Dupree was in custody on that date, and had been booked in since November 6, 2014 and, on that date, was assigned to housing unit H14.
5. That attached hereto as Exhibit " 3 " is the docket sheet maintained on the Second Judicial District website relative to the within case. The docket sheet clearly reflects that Mr. Dupree plead guilty in front of Judge Berry on December 9, 2014, and was sentenced by Judge Flanagan on February 5, 2015.
6. Your Affiant swears and declares under penalty and perjury that the

$$
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foregoing assertions of fact are true and correct.
Further, your Affiant sayeth naught.
DATED this $\underline{3}$ day of February, 2015.


Subscribed and sworn to before me on this $B$ day of February, 2015.


CODE 2605
Richard F. Cornell, Esq.
State Bar No. 1553
150 Ridge Street, Second Floor
Reno, Nevada 89501
775/329-1141
Attorney for Defendant

## THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF

THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
vs.
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant.

Case No. CR14-0058
Dept. No. 1

EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT AFFIDAVIT OF RICHARD JUSTIN

No.

1

2 Description

Return to Custody by Bail Agent
Washoe County Jail website jail
2-04-2015

Washoe County Second Judicial District Court Docket Sheet of Norman Demetrius Dupree

This document does not contain any social security number.
DATED this 17 day of November, 2015.
Respectfully submitted, LAW OFFICES OF RICHARD F. CORNELL 150 Ridge Street, Second Floor
Reno, NV 89501
By: $\frac{\text { Roved } t \rightarrow \infty}{\text { Richard F. Cornell }}$

81

Exhibit 1

82

 $\qquad$


## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SURRENDER OF DEFENDANT BY BAIL ENFORCEMENT AGENT

Surrendered to law enforcement agency of the
State of : NEVADA
Sheriffs Department
County of : WASHOE
Or
Police Department
City of : N/A

Court: SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Bond \#: IS3OK-162345
Amount: $\$ 20,000.00$
Ball Agency: JUSTIN BROS BAIL
Surety: INTERNATIONAL FIDELITY
Case \#: CR:14-0058

Defendant: DUPREE, NORMAN DEMETRIUS / Date of Birth:
Charged with: SELL SCHEDULE 1 OR 2 CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE, 2ND OFFENSE (FELONY),

I hereby certify and declare under penally of perjury by signature below that the above named defendant is now in custody of the law enforcement agency described above.


Signature of Sheriff, Deputy ale Peace Offer, orelerk
Bated


TI $\qquad$
Gloss
Pritedname of personveritying custody

Bond surrender made by:
DOUGLAS M, LEWIS
NEVADA BAIL ENFORCEMENT AGENT, LICENSE\# 60996
235 S. MAINE ST. \# 248
FALLOW, NV, 89406
TEL: (775) 721-1909/ FAX: (775) 546-6169
I hereby certify and declare under penalty of perjury by my signature below that the abof named foflendants now in custody of the law enforcement agency described above.

Signature:
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Case Information
Case Description: CR14-0058 - STATE VS. NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE (D1)
-

```
Filing Date: 10-Jan-2014
Case Type: CR-CRIMINAL
Status: NEF - Proof of Electronic Service
```


## Case Cross Reference

Cross Reference Number

1. DA13177350
2. DAS135736
3. PCNWCASO001252C
4. RCR2013074258
$5 . \operatorname{SCN} 67210$

## Case

Parties (top)


## Event

## Information (top)

Date/Time Hearing Judge Event Description Outcome

1. $05-\mathrm{Feb}-2015 \mathrm{at}$ Honorable,, H 808 , D , 765 - Sentenced filed

0900 , P- PATRICK ELANAGANSENTENCING on $05-\mathrm{Feb}-2015$
Extra Text:

| 2. 09-Dec-2014 at | Honorable | H160- $\quad$ D655-Pled Guilty filed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $09: 00$ | JANET BERRY | ARRAIGNMENTon: 09-Dec-2014 |
|  |  | Extra Text: TO THE |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | ORFORMATION; PSI |
|  |  |  |

$$
88
$$



| 9. 18-Mar-2014 at Honorable, $\quad$ H160-, $\mathrm{L}^{\text {a }}$ D $150-$ Bench Warrant |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09.00 t ¢ JANET BERRY $\quad$ ARRAIGNMENTIss |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\square \square+\square, \square+\square, ~-~ A T ~ \$ 50000000 ~ C A S H-~$ |  |  |
|  |  | - -ONLY . |
| 10. 30-Jan-2014 at | Honorable | H160- D450-Heard-Continued |
| 09:00 | JANET BERRY | ARRAIGNMENTCourt filed on: |
|  |  | 30-Jan-2014 |
|  |  | Extra Text: |
|  |  | DEFENDANT POSITIVE |
|  |  | FOR COCAINE - |
|  |  | MATTER CONTINUED |

## Docket Entry

Information (top)
Docket Description

1. MIN-***Minutes

Date Filed Extra Text
$09-\mathrm{Feb}-2015$ Exifa Text SENTENCING $-02=05-15$ Transaction 4809119 . Approved $B$ : NOREVIEW, 02-09-201511.5816
2. NEF - Proof of

Electronic Service
3. NEF-Proof of

Electronic Service
4. 1850-Judgment of Conviction

09-Feb-2015 Extra Text: Transaction 4809126-Approved By: NOREVIEW : 02-09-2015:11:59:17
06-Feb-2015 Extra Text Transaction 4806185 -Approved By NOREVIEW $0206-201509,31.59$
06-Feb-2015 Extra Text: 02-05-15 - Transaction 4806179 Approved By: NOREVIEW : 02-06-2015:09:30:59
5 EXONF - **CashBail Exon/Pay Fees/Fine 6. COLL - Sent to Collections

8. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service 9. 1930-Ietters

04-Feb-2015 Extra Text: Transaction 4802273 - Approved By: NOREVIEW : 02-04-2015:10:50:58
$04 \mathrm{Feb}-2015$ Extra Text DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY DEFENSE FOR CONSIDERATIONAT SENTENGING Transaction 4802131 . Approved By MCHOLICO 02.04-2015.10.49.57
10. 1930 - Letters ...
11. NEF Proofof Electronic Service 12. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service 13. NEF-Proof of Electronic Service
14. 1652 -Evaluations

04-Feb-2015 Extra Text: DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY DEFENSE FOR CONSIDERATION AT SENTENCING TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL Transaction 4803014 - Approved By: MELWOOD : 02-04-2015:15:06:33

27-Jan-2015 Extra Text: SUBSTANCE ABUSE EVALUATION - Transaction 4789788 Approved By: YLLOYD : 01-27-2015:10:59:53
15. 188 Supreme Court Receip for Doc
16. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service
17. NEF - Proof of Electionic Service
18. 1188 - Supreme Court Receipt for Doc
19. $4185-$ Transcipt
20. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service

04-Feb-2015 Extra Text Transaction 4803595 Approved By) NQREVIEW 02-04-201516:25:16
04-Feb-2015 Extra Text: Transaction 4803124 - Approved By: NOREVIEW : 02-04-2015:15:07:20
27-Jan-2015 Extra Text Transaction 4790038 -Approved By, NOREVIEW $01-27-20151100.55$

22-1an-2015 Extra Text. SUPREME COURT NO. 67210/RECEIPT FORDOCUMENTS Transaction 4784506 - Approved By: NOREVIEW. 01-22-2015.14.48:09
22-Jan-2015 Extra Text: Transaction 4784511 - Approved By: NOREVIEW : 01-22-2015:14:48:59
22-1an-2015 Extra Text Transaction 4785118 , Approved By. NOREVIEW: 01-22-2015:23.35:12
22-Jan-2015 Extra Text: SUPREME COURT NO. 67210/RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS Transaction 4784506 - Approved By: NOREVIEW : 01-22-2015:14:48:09
22-Jan-2015 Extra Text Transaction 4785117 -Approved By NOREVIEW, 01-22-2015.23.34:22
16-Jan-2015 Extra Text: Transaction 4778009 - Approved By: NOREVIEW : 01-16-2015:16:11:34 21. 4500 - PST Confidential 16-Jan-2015 ExtraText Transaction 477773 - Approved By. MELWOOD , 01-16-2015.16.10:38
22. 1310E-Case Appeal 13-Jan-2015 Extra Text: Transaction 4772271-Approved

Statement
23.1350. Cerfificate of Elerk
24. NEF - Proof of

Electronic Service
25.2590 - Notice

Withdrawal of Attomey

By: NOREVIEW : 01-13-2015:16:39:55
13-Jan-2015 Extra Text CERTIFICMTE OF CLERK AND $=T R A N S M I T T A L$ NOTICE OF APPEAL Transaction 472271 Approved By NOREVIEW $01-13-2015 \cdot 16 \cdot 39.55$
13-Jan-2015 Extra Text: Transaction 4772275 - Approved By: NOREVIEW : 01-13-2015:16:40:55
09-Jan-201S Extra Text NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF APPEARANCE AND REPRESENTATION AS COUNSEL OFRECORD
26. SAB - **Supreme Court 09-Jan-2015 Extra Text:

Appeal Bond
27. $\$ 25$ 15 SNotice/Appeal 09 Jan-2015 Extra Text:

Supreme Court
28. PAYRC - **Payment Receipted
29. NEF - Proof of

Electronic Service
30. 4075 - Substitution of Counsel
31. 3370 Order. .

32. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service 33. MIN F** Minutes 34. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service 35. 1785 Guilty Plea Memo/Agteement 36. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service 37. 3795 Reply.
38. 3860 - Request for Submission

09-Jan-2015 Extra Text: A Payment of - $\$ 34.00$ was made on receipt DCDC484358.
$08=5 \mathrm{an}-2015$ Extra Text Transaction 4764815 -Approved BY. NOREVIE $\overline{\text { W }} 01$ 01-08-2015:10:28:25
08 -Jan-2015 Extra Text: SEAN ALEXANDER, DDA/ STATE - Transaction 4764666 - Approved By: MCHOLICO : 01-08-2015:10:27:31
23. Dec 2014 Extra Text. DENYING JUSTINS MOTION FOR RECONSIBERATION - Transaction 4748138-Approved By NOREVIEW: 12-23-2014:13:51:41
23-Dec-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4748142 -Approved By: NOREVIEW : 12-23-2014:13:52:41
$12 \mathrm{Dec}-2014$ Extra Text Arraignment $12 / 9 / 14$-Transaction 4733933 - Approved By: NOREVIEW: 12-12-2014:13:24.51
12-Dec-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4733939 - Approved By: NOREVIEW : 12-12-2014:13:25:52
09 Dec-2014 Extra Text. Transaction 4728619 - Approved By: NOREVIEW: 12-09-2014.15:21:22
09-Dec-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4728631 - Approved By: NOREYIEW: 12-09-2014:15:22:42
08-Dec-2014 Extra Text REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR MOTIONTO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT ENTERED PURSUANT TO NRCP60(B)
08-Dec-2014 Extra Text: DOCUMENT TITLE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR MOTION TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT PARTY SUBMITTING: RICHARD MOLEZZO DATE SUBMITTED: 12-8-14 SUBMTTED BY: S HAMBRIGHT DATE RECEIVED JUDGE OFFICE:
10-Nov-2014 Extra Text Transaction 4689075 Approved By. NOREVIEW 11-10-2014:12:04:32
10-Nov-2014Extra Text: ARRAIGNMENT - DECEMBER 4, 2014@9:00 AM -Transaction 4688948 Approved By: MFERNAND : 11-10-2014:12:02:51
41. 2460 - Mn SetA side 23 -Oc t-2014 Extra Text MOTIONFOR Defaulting
42. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service

RECONSIDERATION AND/OR MOTOIN TO SETASIDE JUDGMENT ENTERED PURSUANT TO NR CP $60(B)$ 06-Oct-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4638571 -Approved By: NOREVIEW : 10-06-2014:13:49:12

$$
92
$$

Notice: This is NOT an Official Court Record

59. 3725 -Proof.. $\quad$ 19-Jun-2014 Extra Text OF CERTIFED MAIL RETURN

19-Jun-2014 Extra lext: OF CERTF ED MA ORD RER OF BAIL FORFEITURE - Transaction 4483129.
Approved By JYOST 06-19-2014:09.14.05 BAIL FORFETTURE - Transaction 4483729-
Approved By JYOST $06-19-2014.09 .14 .05$
60. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service 61. NEF-Proof of Electronic Service
62. 4185 - Transcript
63. NEF Proof of

Electronic Service. 64. 3725 - Proof ...

19-Jun-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4483334 -Approved By: NOREVIEW : 06-19-2014:09:15:08
15-Jun-2014 Extra Text. Trañsaction 447156 -Approved By NOREVIEW -06.15-2014:2117.59
15-Jun-2014 Extra Text: JUNE 10, 2014 MOTION TO ISSUE A BENCH WARRANT - Transaction 4477155 - Approved By: NOREVIEW : 06-15-2014:21:16:59
12-Jun-2014 ExtraText Transaction 4474666 -Approved By. NOREVIEW, $06-12201414: 50.10$
12-Jun-2014 Extra Text: OF CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT NOTICE AND ORDER OF FORFEITURE ( $\$ 20,000.00$ BOND FOR JUSTIN BROS.) Transaction 4474390 - Approved By: YLLOYD : 06-12-2014:14:47:42
65. 2933 - Order for Bai 10 -Jun-2014 Extra Text. Transaction 4470519 -Approved Forfeiture
66. 2560 - Notice of Intent Forfeit Bail
67. NEF - Proof of Electronic Service
68. NEF - Proof of

Electronic Service
69. MIN $-* * *$ Minutes By. NOREVIEW , 06-10-2014:14:37:26
10-Jun-2014 Extra Text: JUSTIN BROS - $\$ 20,000.00$ / BOND NO. IS $30 \mathrm{~K}-162345$
10-Jun-2014 Extra Text Transaction 4469922 Approved By NORE VILW $06610=2014.1135 .35$
10-Jun-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4470525 - Approved By: NOREVIEW: 06-10-2014:14:38:25
10-Jun-2014 Extra Text: $610 / 14$ - ARRAIGNMENT DEFENDANT FALLED TO APPEAR Transaction $469918-$ Approved By. NOREVIIEW 06-10-2014.11.34.43.
70. 1250E-Application for 27-May-2014Extra Text: STATUS / ARRAIGNMENT ON Setting eFile JUNE 10, 2014 AT 9:00 A.M. - Transaction 4449371-Approved By: NOREVIEW : 05-27-2014:13:42:44
7. NEF - Proofol Electronic Service
72. BAIL - **Bailbond

Posted
73. SURR-**Bail Exon $1 /$ Cert Surrender 74. 3725 - Proof ...

27-May-2014Extra Text Transaction 4449375 -Approved $B V \cdot N O R E V I E W$. $0527-2014113.43 .4$
16-May-2014Extra Text:
14-May 2014 Extra Text SLIP SENT 05/19/2014
07-Apr-2014 Extra Text: PROOF OF RETURN ON CERTIFIED MAILING - NOTICE AND ORDER FOR BAIL FORFEITURE Transaction 4375239 - Approved By: MCHOLICO : 04-07-2014:09:45:56
75. NEF-Proof of Electronic Service

07-Apr-2014 Extra Text Transaction 4375315 - Approved By: NOREVIEW •04-07-2014:09:48:08 94
Notice: This is NOT an Official Court Record


|  | AND OR̄DE |
| :---: | :---: |
| 94. NEF - Proof of | 30-Jan-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4283968 - Approved |
| Elect | By: NOREVIEW : 01-30-2014:16:47: |
| 95. MIN-***Min | 14 Extra Text 133014 - ARRAIGNMENT- |
|  | $C O$ |
|  | 2014:16-43.33. |
| 96. 1800-Information | n-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4264651 - Approve By: SHAMBRIG : 01-17-2014:11:03:38 |
| oof of | - Ctra Ter Trasaction 4264814 A Aproved |
| Electronic Service | OREVIEW : 0117 -2014.11:07-15 |
| 98. 4265 - Waiver of | 17-Jan-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4264651 - Approv |
| Preliminary Exam | By: SHAMBRIG : 01-17-2014:11:03:38 |
| 99. NEF-Proofo | 4 Extra Text Transaction 4255833 - Appro |
| Electronic Service | By NOREVIEN 01-14-2014.11:21:20 |
| 100. 1491-Court Se | Jan-2014 Extra Text: Transaction 4255684 - Approve |
| Report | By: JYOST : 01-14-2014:11:15:17 |
| 101. BAM |  |
|  |  |

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to N.R.C.P. 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of LAW
OFFICES OF RICHARD F. CORNELL, and that on this date I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be delivered by Reno Carson Messenger Service, addressed to:

Keith Munro
Washoe County District Attorney's Office Civil Division
One S. Sierra St., $7^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Reno, NV 89501
DATED this $\not \subset$ day of February, 2015.


## Exhibit 12

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SURRENDER OF DEFENDANT BY BAIL ENFORCEMENT AGENT

Surrendered to law enforcement agency of the
State of : NEVADA
Sheriffs Department

County of : WASHOE
Or

Police Department
City of : N/A

Court: SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Bond \#: IS30K-162345
Amount: $\$ 20,000.00$
Bail Agency: JUSTIN BROS BAIL
Surety: INTERNATIONAL FIDELITY

Case \#: CR14-0058

Defendant: DUPREE, NORMAN DEMETRIUS / Date of Birth: 06-29-1977 / SSN: 530-21-9419
Charged with: SELL SCHEDULE 1 OR 2 CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE, 2ND OFFENSE (FELONY).

I hereby certify and declare under penalty of perjury by signature below that the above named defendant is now in custody of the law enforcement agency described above.


Dated: $\qquad$
ID \#: $\qquad$
Signature of Sheriff, Deputy, Jailer, Peace Officer, or Clerk


Printed name of person verifying custody

Bond surrender made by:
DOUGLAS M. LEWIS
NEVADA BAIL ENFORCEMENT AGENT, LICENSE \#60996
235 S. MAINE ST. \# 248
FALLOW, NV. 89406
TEL: (775) 721-1909/FAX: (775) 546~6169
I hereby certify and declare under penalty of perjury by my signature below that the above named deepadint is now in custody of the law enforcement agency described above.

Signature:


## Exhibit 13

CODE 3880
KEITH G. MUNRO
Deputy District Attorney
Bar No. 5074
P.O. Box 11130

Reno, NV 89520-0027
(775) 337-5700

ATTORNEY FOR STATE OF NEVADA
IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
plaintiff,
vs.
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant,

Case No. CR14-0058
Dept. No. 1
$\qquad$ $/$

RICHARD JUSTIN doa JUSTTN BRO. BAII BONDS and INTERNATIONAI, FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY,

Real Parties in Interest.
RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DECLARE JUDGMENT OF OCTOBER 6, 2014, UNENFORCEABLE AND/OR COMPLETELY SATISFIED, AND TO EXONERATE BAIL BOND NO. $1530 \mathrm{~K}-151744$

The State of Nevada, by and through counsel, Christopher J. Hicks, Washoe County District Attorney, and Keith G. Munro, Deputy District Attorney, responds to the motion to declare judgment of October 6, 2014, unenforceable and/or completely satisfied, and to exonerate bail bond no. 1S30K-151744. This response is made and based upon the attached points and authorities, and all other pleadings, papers and exhibits on file in this case.

This Court previously ordered a bail forfeiture judgment and subsequently denied a motion for reconsideration of that decision. A second motion for reconsideration has now been filed. The Washoe County District Attorney's Office, on behalf of the State of Nevada, previously did not oppose the motion to exonerate the bail in this case and will not shift positions at this time. This Court has the discretion whether to grant or deny this motion and should proceed accordingly. NRS 178.509. AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NBS 239B. 030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any person.

Dated this 19 th day of February, 2015.
CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS District Attorney

By /s /Keith G. Munro
KEITH G. MUNRO Deputy District Attorney Bar No. 5074
P.O. Box 11130

Reno, NV 89520-0027 (775) 337-5700

ATtORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the Office of the District Attorney of Washoe County, over the age of 21 years and not a party to nor interested in the within action. I certify that on this date, the foregoing was electronically filed with the Second Judicial District Court by using the ECE System which will send a notice of electronic
filing to the following:
Terrence McCarthy
Donald White, Esq
Carl Hylin, Esq.
Sean Alexander, Esq.
I further certify that on this date, I deposited for mailing in the county mail system, with postage fully prepaid, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document in an envelope addressed to the following:

Richard F. Cornell, Esq. 150 Ridge Street, Second Floor Reno, NV 89501

Dated this 19th day February, 2015.


## Exhibit 14

FLED

Code: 3845
Richard F. Cornell, Esq.
150 Ridge Street, Second Floor
Reno, NV 89501
(775) 329-1141

2015 FEB 24 PM $12: 58$

State Bar \#1553
Attorney for Plaintiff
IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF
NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
Case No.: CR14-0058
vs.
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant.

## REQUEST FOR HEARING

COME NOW, Real Parties in Interest, Richard Justin dba Justin Bros. Bail
Bonds and International Fidelity Insurance Company, and request a hearing in the
nature of oral argument on his/its Motion to Declare Judgment of October 6, 2014 unenforceable and/or completely satisfied, and to exonerate bail bond no. 1S30K151744.

The undersigned avers that there are no social security numbers in this document.

DATED this 24 day of February, 2015.
Respectfully submitted,
LAW OFFICES OF RICHARD F. CORNELL 150 Ridge Street, Second Floor Reno, NV 89501


Richard F. Cornell

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to N.R.C.P. Sb), I certify that I am an employee of LAW
OFFICES OF RICHARD F. CORNELL, and that on this date I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be delivered by Reno Carson

Messenger Service, addressed to:
Keith Munro
Washoe County District Attomey's Office
Civil Division
One S. Sierra St., $7^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Reno, NV 89501

DATED this \#ftgday of February, 2015.


## Exhibit 15

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE SYATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
vs.

NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant,
1

## ORDER

On August 22, 2014, Richard Justin (Justin), dba Justin Bros Bail Bonds, Real Party in Interest and agent acting on behalf of Intemational Fidelity Insurance Conpany, by and through Counsel, Richard Molezzo, Esq, filed a Motion for Exomeration of Bond pursuant to NRS 176A.330. On October 3, 2014, the Court entered an Order denying Justin's Motion because the Defendant had not appeared before the Court since January 30, 2014.

On October 23, 2014, Justin filed a Motion for Reconsideration. On Decenaber 8, 2014, Justin filed a Repiy and submitted the natter for the Court's decision. On December 23, 2014, this Court denied Justin's Molion for Reconsideration finding Jugtin failed to present substantially different evidence, persuasive legal authority, nor demonstrated that the court was clearly erroneous.

On February 17, 2015, Justin, by and through counsel, Richard F. Cornell, Esq., filed a Motion to Declare Judgment of October 6. 2014 Unenforceable and/or Completely Satisfed, and to
forfeiture. Upon release, the Washoe County Sheriff's Office provided Dupree with paperwork that instructed him to contact the Court or his Counsel to obtain the date of his next court appearance.

Dupree's arraignment was scheduled to occur June 10, 2014, which allowed defendant's counsel sufficient time within which to contact Dupree. However, Dupree, once again, failed to appear on June 10, 2014, During the June 10, 2014, hearing, the Court ordered Bond Number 3 (posted by Justin Bros. Bail Bonds) be forfeited. Justin Bros. Bail Bonds was notified via certified mail of said order.

On December 8, 2014, Dupree was surrendered on Justin' second bond, Justin did not timely address the forfeiture of Bond Number 1, 1S30K-151744.

On December 9, 2014, Dupree pled guilty and was sentenced on February 5, 2015.
Justin alleges bail bond no, 1S30K-151744 was exonerated by operation of law when Dupree was remanded into custody in January of 2014. Justin relies upon People v. International Fidelity Insurance Co., 138 Cal. Rptr. 3 d 883 (Cal. App. 2012), to support this assertion. The Court notes California law is not binding on this Court. In International Fidelity Insurance, the Count of Appeals found a bond could not be reinstated without notice to the surety after the defendant had been remanded into custody. $l d$. at 885 . Additionally, the Court of Appeals held the bond was exonerated by operation of law pursuant to Cal. Penal Code section $1305(\mathrm{c})(1)$, which requires the court to direct forfeiture to be vacated and a bond exonerated if the defendant appears voluntarily in custody within the 180 days of the date of forfeiture, and if the court fails to do so, the bond shall be vacated and exonerated by operation of law. Int'l Fid Ins. Co, 138 Cal. Rptr 3d 886-87. Nevada law does not provide such a mechanism for exoneration of a bond, nor toes Justin point to any Nevada statute or case authority to support the reasoning followed by the California Court of Appeals.

Justin relies upon NRS 178.509(1)(a) which provides that when a defendant fails to appear, "the court shall not exonerate the surety before the date of forfeiture" unless the defendant appears before the court and the court determines the defendant has presented a satisfactory excuse or the surety did not in any way cause or aid the absence of the defendant. However, on January 31, 2014; when Dupree was remanded to custody he did not appear before the court, but was remanded based
-3.

Exonerate Bail Bond No. 1S30K-15I744. The State filed a response and Justin submitted the matter for the court's decision.

On September 19, 2013, Justin Bros. Bail Bonds issued Bond No. 1S30K-151744 (Bond Number 1) to Norman Dupree, While out of custody on Bond Number 1, Duple appeared before the Court for an arraignment on January 30, 2014. During the hearing, the Court ordered Dupree to be tested for drug use, as it appeared to the Court that Dupree was under the influence of a narcotic. Following a positive finding of cocaine and marijuana, Duprec's status was changed from bail to supervised bail. Duple was ordered to be supervised by Pretrial Services. The arraignment was continued to March 18, 2014, in hopes Dupree would appear clean and sober.

On January 31, 2014, Dupree was remanded to custody based upon a pretrial supervision violation, but Dupree did not appear before the Court at that time. The violation order and request for remand were sent to chambers for the Judge's signature. The Court set bail at Twenty Thousand Dollars ( $\$ 20,000$ ). On February 3, 2014, Duple posted the Twenty Thousand Dollar ( $\$ 20,000$ ) bail bond (AS30K-73200) (Bond Number 2) through Bonafide Bail Bonds. During Drupree's time of incarceration from January 31, 2014, through February 3, 2014, Justin Bros. Bail Bonds never attempted to surrender Bond Number 1.

Subsequently, Duple failed to appear for the March 18, 2014, arraignment and the Court ordered a bench warrant be issued and set bail at Fifty Thousand Dollars ( $\$ 50,000$ ) cash only. The Bench Warrant was filed on March 21, 2014. The Court further ordered both previously posted bail bonds be forfeited, ie., Bond Number 1 and Bond Number 2. See Ex. 1 Notice of Intent to Forfeit, March 18, 2014. Both Justin Bros. Bail Bonds and Bonafide Bail Bonds were notified via certified mail of said order. See Ex. 2 Proof of Mailing.

On May 14, 2014, Bonafide Bail Bonds surrendered Dupree to the custody of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, at which point their bond was exonerated.

On May 15, 2014, Dupree posted bail bond (IS30K-162345) (Bond Number 3) through Justin Bros. Bail Bonds. At this point, Justin Bros. Bail Bonds still did not seek to surrender Bond Number 1, but instead posted Bond Number 3. Justin Bros. knew or should have known that forfeiture was pending on Bond Number 1 because the Court had already sent certified notices of
upon a pretrial supervision violation. During Dupree's time of ittearcetation from January 31, 2014, through February 3, 2014, Justin never attempted to surrender the bond. There is no support in NRS 178.509 (1) for finding automatic exoneration through operation of law.

The Court has considered the motion and other papers in their entirety. The Court finds Justin has not presented persuasive legal authority, nor have they demonstrated that the Court's decision was clearly erroneous. Accordingly, and good cause appearing, Justin's Motion to Declare Judgment of October 6, 2014 Unenforceable and/or Completely Satisfied, and to Exonerate Bail Bond No. IS30K-151744 is DENIED.

IT Is SO ORDERED.
DATED this $10^{t^{\text {th }}}$ day of March 2015

-4-
$10 \%$

## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am en employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe; that on this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2015, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following:

Rack Young/Travis Lucia, Deputies District Attomey Washoe County District Attomey's Office

Carl Hylin/Donald White, Deputies Public Defender Washoe County Public Defender's Office

Richard F. Cornell, Esq.


## Exhibit 16

March 11, 2015
International Fidelity Insurance Company
1 Newark Center - $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor, Bond Dept.
Newark, NJ 07102
Justin Brothers Bail Bonds
235 South Sierra Street
Reno, NV 89501
Re: Bail Forfeiture Judgment in CR14-0058 (Norman Demetrius Dupree)
Bond Number: IS30K-151744

## Dear Agent:

Please find enclosed a certified copy of the Order dated March 10, 2015 and a certified copy of the Bail Forfeiture Judgment dated October 6, 2014, filed in the case named above. In order to avoid a suspension being placed on your company, please remit payment within ten (10) business days from the date of this letter for the full bond amount. Payment in the amount of $\$ 25,000,00$ must be received no later than $4: 00 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. on the tenth business day, March 25, 2015.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at (775) 328-3569 or by email at cathy.hil@washoecourts.us.

Sincerely,


Merrill Lyngh
Bantiolatitica
 Vardey, PA 190675557

5039 3/24/2015

Richard Justin BUF Trust
PO Box 9810
Calabasas, CA $91372-9810$
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# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF Electronically Filed <br> $\star \star \star \star \star \star$Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court 

RICHARD JUSTIN, JUSTIN BROS BAIL BONDS, and INTERNATIONAL FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY, Petitioners,

## V.

JANET J. BERRY, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS DEPARTMENT 1 OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent,

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

## EXHIBITS TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

## RICHARD JUSTIN, <br> DBA JUSTIN BROS. BAIL BONDS AND INTERNATIONAL FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY CASE NO.

## EXHIBITS TO ORIGINAL PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

| NO. | DESCRIPTION | DATE | PAGES |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Various Washoe County Jail Inmate <br> Booking and Release Forms for | $9-18-13$ <br> $1-31-14$ <br> $5-14-14$ <br> $5-15-14$ | $1-7$ |
|  | Norman DeMetrius Dupree and Bond <br> IS30K-162345 | $3-18-14$ | $8-9$ |
| 2 | Notice of Intent to Forfeit | $3-19-14$ | $10-14$ |
| 3 | Order of Bail Forfeiture | $8-22-14$ | $15-19$ |
| 4 | Motion for Exoneration of Bond | $9-18-14$ | $20-22$ |
| 5 | Response to Motion for Exoneration of <br> Bail Bond | $10-03-14$ | $23-26$ |
| 6 | Order | $10-06-14$ | $27-28$ |
| 7 | Bail Forfeiture Judgment | $10-23-14$ | $29-54$ |
| 8 | Motion for Reconsideration and/or <br> Motion to Set Aside Judgment Entered <br> Pursuant to NRCP 60(B) | $12-08-14$ | $55-60$ |
| 9 | Reply in Support of Motion for <br> Reconsideration [etc.] | $12-23-14$ | $61-63$ |
| 10 | Order | $2-17-15$ | $64-97$ |
| 11 | Motion to Declare Judgment of <br> October 6, 2014 Unenforceable and/or <br> Completely Satisfied, and to Exonerate <br> Bail Bond No. IS30K-151744 | (11-16-14 <br> 12Acknowledgment of Surrender of <br> Defendant by Bail Enforcement Agent | 98 |


| 13 | Response to Motion to Declare <br> Judgment [etc.] | $2-19-15$ | $99-101$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| 14 | Request for Hearing | $2-24-15$ | $102-104$ |
| 15 | Order | $3-10-15$ | $105-109$ |
| 16 | Demand Letter of Second Judicial <br> District Payment Under Protest | $3-11-15$ | 110 |

## Exhibit 1



> THIS REPORT NOT OQEREPRODUCL


## PHS REPORT NOT QERAPRODUCZ



UNLAWFUL DISSEMINATION UF IHES RESTRICTED INFORMATION IS PROHIBITED. VIOLATION WILL SUBNECT THE OFFENDER TO CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LIABLIIY Run Can't Hide REL TO: DougLewis a Kuail Bonds
DATE: $\quad 10 / 21 / 14$ WASHOE COUNTY SGERIF'S OFFICE
BY:


> THIS REPORT NOT TO REREQRODHMT


## THIS REPORT NOT <br> IO BE REPRODUCE



UNLANHUI OISSEMINATION OF THIS
RESTRICTEO INFORMATION IS PROHBITED.
VIOLATION WIL SUBJECT THE OFFENDER
To CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LABILITY Run Can't Hide
REL TO: Doug Lewts \& Bail Bonds
DATE: $\quad 10 / 21 / 14$
THIS REMORMMOT
M"MWOLUSLE
WY: Cul 4266


## THIS REPORT MOT <br> DBEREPRODUCE



## Exhibit 2



## AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING.

STATE OF NEVADA ) ) SS.
COUNTY OF WASHOE.)
The undersigned, being duly sworn, desposes and says:
That on $3 / 18 / 2014$, I personally placed in an envelope, postage prepaid, certified mail, a copy of the foregoing Notice of Intent to Forfeit to each addressee listed below and deposited the same in the Post Office at Reno, Nevada, to wit:

District Attorney's Office
via-Inter-Office Mail

INTERNATIONAL FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY
1 Newark Center 20th Floor - Bond Department
Newark NJ 07102

JUSTIN BROS. BAIL BONDS
235 S. Sierra Street
Reno NV 89501

Subscribed and sworn to before me $3 / 18 / 2014$.


Exhibit 3

# IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 

 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOETHE STATE OF NEVADA

Plaintiff,
vs.
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant.

## ORDER OF BAIL FORFEITURE

This matter having come before the Court on March 18, 2014, and the defendant failed to appear, effecting a breach of condition of bail in the amount of $\$ 25,000.00$, Bond No. IS30K-151744.

According to law, in 180 days, the Court shall declare a forfeiture of the bail, pursuant to N.R.S. $178.506,178.508,178.509$ and 178.514 .

IT IS SO ORDERED.
Dated this $\qquad$ day of March, 2014.


## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, County of Washoe; that on 19 day of Mare, 2014, I deposited in the County mailing system for postage and mailing with the U.S. Postal Service in Reno, Nevada, or by the other manner noted below, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document addressed to:

## District Attorney's Office (Via E-Filing)

INTERNATIONAL FIDELITY ISSUANCE COMPANY
1 Newark Center - $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor, Bond Department
Newary, NJ 0712

JUSTIN BROS BAIL BONDS
235 S. Sierra Street
Reno, NV 89501
Public Defender's Office (Via E-Fling)
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 tuition, fines, restitution, payments or penalties, or any whey condition



Exhibit 4

CODE 2490
RICHARD MOLEZZO, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No.: 5072
96 Winter Street
Reno, NV 89503
Attorney for
Richard Justin, Justin Bros Bail Bonds
Real Party In Interest,
Agent Acting on Behalf of
International Fidelity Insurance Co.
808 E. Musser Street
Carson City, NV 89701
Tele: 775-841-6400

## IN THE SECOND JUDICLAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

Plaintiff,
vs.
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant.

MOTION FOR EXONERATION OF BOND
COMES NOW, RICHARD JUSTIN, Justin Bros Bail Bonds (hereinafter "Justin"), Read Party in Interest, as Agent for International Fidelity Insurance Company, by and through his attorney of record hereby submits his Motion for Bxoneration of the above-referenced Bond based upon the attached memorandum of points and authorities, the papers and pleadings on fite herein and the attached exhibits incorporated herein by reference.

Undersigned counsel hereby certifies that a copy of this Motion will be delivered to all interested parties involved in the above-referenced case.

Dated this $\hat{\gamma}$ day of August, 2014.

RICHARD A. MOLEZZO, ESQQ.
Attorney for Richard Justin, Justin Bros Bail Bonds
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## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

On March 18, 2014, Defendant failed to appear at his scheduled court appearance according to the Notice of Intent to Forfeit.

Notice of Defendants Failure to Appear was mailed on or about the $19^{\text {th }}$ day of March 2014; per statute the 180 day due date is the $10^{\text {d/ }}$ day of September, 2014, with three days for mailing the appropriate due date is the $13^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2014, therefore this motion is timely.

This Motion is brought pursuant to NRS 176A 330(1)(b) and (2)(d), as well the inherent powers of this Court and based upon new information described more fully below. Justin on behalf of International Fidelity Insurance Company respectfully request that the abovereferenced bond be exonerated due to said bond should have been exonerated prior to Defendant's failure to appear. A review of the docket will reveal the reason that this bond should have already been exonerated and the following is a chronological order of events:

On i or about, the $10^{\text {th }}$ day of January, 2014, Defendant's bond number IS 30K-151744 for $\$ 25,000$ was transferred from Reno Justice Court to this Court; and,

On or about the $31^{\text {st }}$ day of January; 2014, Defendant's supervised bail is revoked and Defendant is remanded to Jail. The above bond should have been exonerated at this time, but instead it is not and the following is a chronological description of what happens:

On or about the $3^{\text {rd }}$ day of February, 2014, Bonafide Bail Bonds re-bails the Defendant on a $\$ 20,000.00$ bond and at this time is when Justin Bros Bail Bonds $\$ 25 ; 000$ bond should have been exonerated; however; it is not instead;

On the $18^{\text {th }}$ day of March, 2014, Defendant again fails to appear at the scheduled arraignment and a notice of intent to forfeit bond is sent to both Justin Bros and Bonafide Bait Bonds and a $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant is issued; and

On the $21^{\text {st }}$ day of March, 2014, Defendant tries to surrender himself three (3) times to
the Washoe County Sheriff's Department to no avail. Defendant is being advised that there is no warrant for him in their system. Defendant goes to Bonafide who surrenders Defendant to the custody of the Washoe County Sheriff's Department and Bonafide's bond is exonerated on the $14^{\text {th }}$ day of May 2014, but not Justin Bros. However, the $\$ 50,000$ Cash Only Warrant is never filed with any agency therefore the Washoe County Sheriff's Department is not aware of the cash only conditions; and,

On or about the $14^{\text {th }}$ day of May, 2014, this Court exonerates Bonafides Bond and sent the exoneration to Bona File; Still, Justin Bros Bond is not yet exonerated, but should have been when Defendant was remanded back into custody, this is not what happened. Or Justin Bros Bond should have been exonerated when Bonafide stepped in and provided a bond for the Defendant, yet still Justin's bond number 1S30K-151744 for $\$ 25,000$ has not yet been exonerated; and,

On or about the $16^{\text {th }}$ day of May, 2014, Justin posts a $\$ 20,000$ bond number IS 30K162345 on behalf of the Defendant not being aware of the $\$ \$ 50,000$ Cash Only". set by this Court due to the warrant not being properly filed with the proper authorities, and neither did the Washoe County Sheriff's Department; and,

On or about the $27^{\text {th }}$ day of May, 2014, this Court set a Status/Arraignment for the $10^{\text {tit }}$ day of June, 2014, which this Court never notified Justin with the new date and it is unclear whether or not the Defendant was notified. Defendant again failed to appear on that date and therefore this Court notified Justin by sending the Notice of Intent to Forfeit on Bond number IS $30 \mathrm{~K}-162345$ for $\$ 20,000$ on or about the same day. $\$$ till bond number $1 \mathrm{~S} 30 \mathrm{~K}-151744$ for $\$ 25,000$ is still in forfeiture status and the same should be exonerated based upon the above. When this court revoked Defendant's bond, Justin Bros Bond number 1\$30K-151744, should have been exonerated; When Bonafide posted its bond, Justin's bond should have been exonerated, but it still has not been exonerated.

Page 3 of 5 .

Justin is in contact with the defendant and the Defendant is due to turn himself in to the proper authorities after the birth of his child. However, Bond Number 1S30K-151744 for $\$ 25,000$ is still under forfeiture status and it should not be, therefore, it is proper to exonerate the $\$ 25,000$ bond at this time.

The decision to grant exoneration or discharge of a bond rests with the discretion of the trial judge, as long as the sureties do not aid in the defendant's absence. NRS 178.509; NRS 178.512(2); State v. Indemnity Ins. Co. of N. Am., 2 Kan.App.2d 672 P.2d 251, 254 (Kan, Ct. App. 1983). Justin did not in any way, shape or fashion aid or collude in the non appearance of the above named Defendant.

Exoneration refers to a court order that discharges a person from liability: In this case when the Court remanded defendant to custody, it relieve the bondman from any further liability and especially the surety company's liability. Furthermore when a cash bail has been posted the previous bond is then relieved of any further liability and therefore should be exonerated.

Forfeitures are not favored at law, and statutes imposing them must be strictly construed. Wilshire Insurance Co. v. State, $94 \mathrm{Nev} .546,582 \mathrm{P} .2 \mathrm{~d} .372$ (1978). In this cases, pursuant to NBS 178.509 (3)(a) and (b) is written in pertinent part,
"...3. If the court exonerates a surety pursuant to this section and there is any undertaking or money deposited instead of bail bond where the defendant has been charged with a gross misdemeanor or felony, the court shall:
(a) Prepare an order exonerating the surety; and
(b) Forward a copy of the order to the Office of Court Administrator."

WHEREFORE, the Real Parties in Interest pray that this Honorable Court grant the exoneration of the bond as discussed above for any further relief this Court deems just and proper in the premises.

Dated this $\qquad$ day of August, 2014. $\qquad$

$\qquad$

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am Petitioner in the above entitled case and that on this 27 day of August 2014, I served the foregoing on all parties to this action by: xx placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope placed for collection
$\qquad$ in the United States Mail, at Reno, Nevada, postage paid, following ordinary business practices.
$\qquad$ personal delivery
contain any social security numbers of any person Pursuant to NRS 239B.030.
DATED this 7 day of August 2014.

Exhibit 5

CODE 3880
TERRANCE SHEA
Deputy District Attorney
Bar Number: 29
P.O. Box 11130

Reno, Nevada 89520
(775) 328-5700

ATTORNEY FOR STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

VS.
Case No. CR14-0058

NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE

Defendant.

JUSTIN BAIL BONDS, and
INTERNATIONAL FIDELITY
INSURANCE
COMPANY,

Real Parties in Interest.


RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR EXONERATION OF BAIL BOND
COMFS NOW the state of Nevada by and through its attorneys of record Richard $A$. Gammick, Washoe County District Attorney, and Terrance Shea, Washoe County Deputy District Attorney, and hereby files its Response to Motion for Exoneration of Bond. This response is based upon the attached Points and Authorities
and all the papers and pleadings on file with this Honorable Court.

## POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Assuming, for the purposes of this Motion only, the truth of the matters asserted by the bondsmen, and reserving all objections of any kind to the same in any future filings, the State has no objection to the motion for exoneration of bond.

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO RS 239B.030
The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any person.

Dated this $18^{\text {th }}$ day of September of 2014.
RICHARD A. GAMMICK
District Attorney

By /s/ Terrance Shea
TERRANCE SHEA
Deputy District Attorney
Bar NO. 29
P.O. Box 11130

Reno, NV 89520
(775) 337-5700

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

Pursuant to NRCP $5(b), T$ certify that $I$ am an employee of the Office of the District Attorney of Washoe County, over the age of 21 years and not a party to nor interested in the within action. I certify that on this date, I deposited for mailing in the county mail system for deposit in the U.S. Mails, with postage fully prepaid, and true and correct copy of the foregoing document in an envelope addressed to the following:

Richard Mollezo, Esq. 96 Winter Street Reno, NV 89503

Dated this $18^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2014
/s/ L. Massenkoff
L. Massenkoff

## Exhibit 6

# IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 

 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOETHE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
vs.

NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,

## Defendant.

f

## ORDER

On August 22, 2014, Richard Justin, (hereinafter "Justin") doa Justin Bros Bail Bonds, Real Party in Interest and agent acting on behalf of International Fidelity Insurance Company, by and through counsel, Richard Molezzo, Esq., filed a Motion for Exoneration of Bond ${ }^{l}$ pursuant to NRS 176A.330. The bond (IS30K-151744), which is subject of this Motion, shall be referenced as "Bond Number 1."

The record reflects Defendant Norman Demetrius Dupree (hereinafter "Dupree") was arrested and subsequently posted bail by way of Bond Number 1. While out of custody on Bond Number 1, Dupree appeared before the Court for an arraignment on January 30, 2014.

During the hearing, the Court ordered Dupree to be tested for drug use. Following a positive finding of cocaine and marijuana, Dupree's status was changed from bail to supervised bail, and was ordered to be supervised by Pretrial Services. The arraignment was continued to March 18, 2014.
'Three bail bonds have been issued in this case; all three will be discussed herein.

On January 31, 2014, Dupree was remanded to custody based upon a pretrial supervision violation. The Court set bail at Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000). On February 3, 2014, Dupree posted the Twenty Thousand Dollar $(\$ 20,000)$ bail bond (AS30K-73200) through Bonafide Bail Bonds. This bond is referenced herein as "Bond Number 2."

During Dupree's time of incarceration from January 31, 2014, through February 3, 2014, Justin Bros. Bail Bonds never attempted to surrender Bond Number 1.

Subsequently, Dupree failed to appear for the March 18, 2014, arraignment and the Court ordered a bench warrant be issued and set bail at Fifty Thousand Dollars $(\$ 50,000)$ cash only ${ }^{2}$. The Bench Warrant was filed on March 21, 2014.

The Court further ordered both previously posted bail bonds be forfeited, ie., Bond Number 1 and Bond Number 2. Both Justin Bros. Bail Bonds and Bonafide Bail Bonds were notified via certified mail of said order.

On May 14, 2014, Bonafide Bail Bonds surrendered Dupree to the custody of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, at which point Bond Number 2 was exonerated.

On May 15, 2014, Dupree posted bail bond (IS30K-162345) through Justin Bros. Bail Bonds. This bond is referenced herein as "Bond Number 3."

At this point, Justin Bros. Bail Bonds still did not seek to surrender Bond Number 1. Upon release, the Washoe County Sheriff's Office provided Dupree with paperwork that instructed him to contact the Court or his Counsel to obtain the date of his next court appearance.

Dupree's arraignment had now been scheduled to occur June 10, 2014, which allowed counsel sufficient time within which to contact Dupree. However, Dupree failed to appear on June 10, 2014. At the June 10, 2014, arraignment, Dupree's Counsel outlined the attempts made to notify Dupree of the arraignment date, including: (1) mailing a letter to Dupree advising of the arraignment date (the letter was not returned by the U.S. Postal Service); (2) calling Dupree's cellular number (which turned out to be no longer in service); and (3) communicating with Dupree's parents who agreed to contact Dupree and provide him with the June 10, 2014, arraignment date.

[^1]During the June 10, 2014, hearing, the Court ordered Bond Number 3 (posted by Justin Bros. Bail Bonds) be forfeited. Justin Bros. Bail Bonds was notified via certified mail of said order.

Pursuant to the request of Dupree's counsel, a status hearing was scheduled for July 24, 2014, and Dupree failed to appear. Defendant's Counsel indicated a letter was sent to Defendant regarding the court date and it had not been returned by the U.S. Postal Service.

The Court ordered no further action was necessary, as the March 21, 2014, bench warrant with bail set at Fifty Thousand Dollar ( $\$ 50,000$ ) cash only, remained active.

In the Motion for Exoneration of Bond, Justin contends Bond Number 1 should have been exonerated prior to Defendants failure to appear on March 18, 2014. Justin further indicates their company is in contact with Dupree, yet has failed to surrender the Defendant to the proper authorities, therefore preventing the exoneration of both their bonds (Bond Number I and Bond Number 3).

At this time Dupree has not been arraigned by this Court and, to the Court's knowledge, remains out of custody. As previously noted, a Bench Warrant has been issued for Dupree.

The Court has considered the arguments of counsel and the record in its entirety. The Court finds Bond Number 1 could not have been exonerated at any time because the Defendant has not appeared before the Court since January 30, 2014.

Accordingly, and good cause appearing, Defendant's Motion for Exoneration of Bond (referencing Justin Bros Bail Bond Number IS30K-151744), is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: This 3 rd day of $\qquad$ , 2014.


## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe; that on this
 day of Detwober 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following:

Rack Young/Travis Lucia, Deputies District Attorney
Washoe County District Attorney's Office

Carl Hylin/Donald White, Deputies Public Defender
Washoe County Public Defender's Office

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, County of Washoe; that on this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2014, I deposited in the County mailing system for postage and mailing with the United States Postal Service in Reno, Nevada, a true copy of the attached document addressed to:

Richard Molezzo Esq.
96 Winder Street
Reno, NV 89503
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IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,
vs:
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant.
$\qquad$

## BAIL FORFEITURE JUDGMENT

Pursuant to an Order of Forfeiture in compliance with the provisions of NRS 178.508 and NRS 178.514, and all the requirements of said statutes having been satisfied,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that judgment be entered for the State of Nevada and against International Fidelity Insurance Company in the amount of TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS ( $\$ 25,000.00$ ), Bond no. IS30K-151744.

Dated this $6^{4}$ day of Dctober_2014.

Case No. CR14-0058
Dept. No. 1


,

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Case No. CR14-0058
Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, County of Washoe; that on the $0^{\text {th }}$ day of October 2014, I electronically filed the Bail Forfeiture Judgment with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system.

I further certify that I transmitted a true and correct copy of the foregoing document by the methods) noted below:

Electronically via the ECF system:
Zach Young, Esq. for the State of Nevada
Division of Parole \& Probation
Donald White, Esq. for Norman D. Dupree
Carl Hylin, Esq. for Norman D. Dupree
Richard Molezzo, Esq.
Travis Lucia, Esq. for the State of Nevada
Deposited in the Washoe County mailing system for postage and mailing:
Washoe County District Attorney's Office
Attn: Karen Hollister
(via inter-office mail)
Justin Brothers Bail Bonds
235 South Sierra Street
Reno, NV 89501
CDR: 70042570000536476165
International Fidelity Insurance Company
1 Newark Center - $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor, Bond Dept.
Newark, NJ 07102
CAR: $700425700005 \quad 3647 \quad 6172$


## Exhibit 8

CODE: 2460
RICHARD A. MOLEZZO, ESQ.
State Bar No.: 5072
96 Winter Street
Reno, NV 89503
Tele: 775-786-5800
Attorney for Real Parties In Interest
Richard Justin, Justin Bros Bail Bonds
Agent Acting on Behalf of
International Fidelity Insurance Co.
808 E. Musser Street
Carson City, NV 89701
Tele: 775-841-6400
Fax: 775-841-1990

## IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

STATE OF NEVADA
Plaintiff,
vs.
NORMAN DEMETRIUS DUPREE,
Defendant.

CASE NO.: CR14-0058
DEPT NO.: 1
BOND NO.: 1S30K-151744
BOND AMT: $\$ 25,000.00$

## MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR

## MOTION TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT ENTERED PURSUANT TO NRCP 60(B)

COMES NOW, RICHARD JUSTIN, Justin Bros Bail Bonds (hereinafter "Justin"), Real Party in Interest, as Agent for International Fidelity Insurance Company, by and through undersigned counsel, and hereby submits his Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's Order entered the $3^{\text {rd }}$ day of October, 2014 denying Exoneration of the above-referenced bond; and/or Motion to Set Aside Judgment entered in the above-reference matter on the $6^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2014 herein.

This motion is made and based upon the attached memorandum of points and authorities, all of the papers and pleading on file herein.

Undersigned Counsel hereby certifies that a copy of this Motion will be sent to all persons involved in the above-entitled case.

Dated this $\qquad$ day of October, 2014.


Richard A. Molezzo, Esq.
Attorney for Richard Justin, Justin Bros Bail Bonds

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. MOTION BACKGROUND

On the $22^{\text {nd }}$ day of August, 2014, Justin by and through undersigned counsel filed his Motion to Exonerate the above-referenced bond based upon pretrial services revoking defendant's release on the 31st day of January, 2014 and defendant was remanded to custody.

On the $18^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2014, the Deputy District Attorney Terrance Shea filed his Response to said Motion stating in pertinent part, "...the State has no objection to the motion for exoneration of bond." (Response; p.2, Line 7). The Deputy District Attorney agreed with Justin in exoneration of said bond.

On the $3^{\text {rd }}$ day of October, 2014, this Court entered it Order denying the motion based upon the entire history of the case and that Justin did not surrender the defendant to custody. It is noted however, this Court did not cite any statutory or case authority in which it relied its decision upon.

On the $6^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2014, this Court entered its Judgment upon the record against Justin in the amount of $\$ 25,000$ as forfeiture for the above-referenced bond; therefore, this motion follows.

## II. ISSUES IN QUESTION

1. Whether or not revoking defendant's release under bond number IS 30K-151744 on the 31st day of January, 2014, revokes said bond; and does the revocation relieve the bondsman and surety from any further liability?
2. Whether or not the District Court erred in issuing a forfeiture and subsequent judgment on the above-reference bond due to the revocation of the defendant's release and setting a new bail?

## II. DISCUSSION OF CASE

When defendant was originally arrested, in pertinent part to this case, he was charged with 2 felony counts; his $1^{\text {st }}$ count is possession, which carries a bail amount of $\$ 5,000$ and his $2^{\text {nd }}$ charges is sales of a controlled substance, which carries a bail amount of $\$ 20,000$ according to the bail schedule. Justin posted his bond on the $18^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2013 for $\$ 25,000$. This bond was subsequently transferred from Reno Justice Court to this Court. SEE Exhibit 1 , which is the Washoe County Jail's printout information.

During the administration of this Case there have been numerous clerical errors that have been entered on its record, and must be corrected to reflect the accuracy of this case. Justin agrees with this Court's assessment of such history, with a few exceptions that will be clarified as follows:

On January 31, 2014, pretrial services revoked defendant's release, and he was remanded to custody. Once a defendant's release is revoked and a new bail is set for the same criminal charge, i.e., Sales of a Controlled Substance and posted by a new bond agency, the first bond must be exonerated by operation of law. Justin completely relied upon this fact as he does in all other courts in this county. Sparks Justice, Reno Justice, Incline Justice, and Wadsworth Justice Court's automatically exonerate a bond once the above takes place. SEE Exhibit "2" attached hereto, which is the Washoe County Sheriff"s Department ("WSCO") booking recap. Defendant was booked into the Washoe County Sheriff's Department under "revoked" status, and defendant had to post a new bond for the $\$ 20,000$. Once a new bond is posted, Justin's bond is exonerated by operation of law.

Surely, this Honorable Court understands once something is revoked, it does not also have to be surrendered? Moreover, once a new bail has been set, and a new bond has been posted, it automatically exonerates the first bond. Merriam-Webster's dictionary defines revoked as "to officially cancel the power or effect of (something, such as a law, license, agreement, etc.), to make (something) not valid". (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary 345 (9th ed.1983)). If the bond is not valid then the forfeiture nor the judgment cannot be valid.

In short there are 2 statutory reasons why the declaration of forfeiture of bond 1 is void; 1) by pretrial services revoking defendant's release, thereby revoking Justin's $\$ 25,000$ bond prior to the forfeiture; and 2 ) a new bail was set by the Court and subsequently posted by Bonafide for $\$ 20,000$; (once the new bond posted it completely exonerated Justin of liability). The surietyship along with custody of the defendant changed from Justin to the WCSD. NRS 178.509(1)(b)(4), "...being detained by civil authorities...", therefore, once pretrial services had defendant taken into custody and transported to the WCSO, the surietyship transfers to the jailers and the defendant is no longer under the jurisdiction of Justin. Once Bonafide posted its bond, the new surietyship and custody of defendant belongs only to Bonafide, not Justin,

Therefore, the first error in this case began, when the Court declared forfeiture on Justin's bond and Bonafides Bond, it should have only been Bonafide's forfeiture due to defendant's failure to appear on March 18, 2014. It is our contention that this Court has no jurisdiction to forfeit Justin's bond. The surrender of said bond is unnecessary. The bond must be exonerated by operation law.

On March 18, 2014 the defendant failed to appear at his hearing scheduled herein is when the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant was issued for the defendant; however, this warrant is not entered in the system as it should have been.

On or about the $14^{\text {th }}$ day of May, 2014, defendant telephoned Justin and informed him that there was a warrant for his arrest and he needed to surrender himself. Defendant presented himself to the WCJ and they refised to take him into custody due to "no warrant" for his arrest. Justin advised defendant to present himself to Bonafide for surrender, due to Justin's belief that his bond no longer existed and was waiting on the exoneration of said bond.

On the $14^{\text {th }}$ of May, 2014, defendant was surrendered by Bonafide and the WCSO records reflect this situation. The defendant's charges were "Sale of a Controlled Substance", in the same original charge from 2013, and based upon this one charge, a new proper bail amount of $\$ 20,000$ was set by Bonafide's surrender due to this being the only information available. (See Exhibit 1 and 3). At this time, WCSO is unaware of a $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant issued for the

defendant.
On the $15^{\text {th }}$ day of May, 2014, defendant was re-bailed by Justin at the proper bai amount of $\$ 20,000$, (bond number 3). This bond is a re-write of the original bond at no charge to the defendant. Bond 3 replaces Bond 1 and 2, exonerating both bond 1 and 2 . Neither the WCSO nor Justin knew about the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant. If the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant would have been entered into the system, when it was originally ordered, surely Justin could not have bailed the defendant on the $\$ 20,000$ bond, which is correctly under forfeiture status and Justin is currently looking for the defendant to bring him to justice. SEE Exhibit " 3 " attached hereto.

One of the clerical errors mentioned above, is the $\$ 50,000$ cash bail warrant was not entered prior to the May $15^{\text {th }}$ date. It was not entered on the $21^{\text {st }}$ day of March, 2014 as the docket now reflects until after the June 10,2014 hearing. This is not an uncommon occurrence of late with the Second Judicial District Court. In Justin's opinion, errors have been ongoing of this nature for approximately 10 years. This type of situation must be corrected by this Court and this Court must ensure these clerical errors do not happen in the future.

On the $10^{\text {th }}$ day of June, 2014, defendant failed to appear again at a hearing held herein. The Honorable Judge Lidia Stiglich ordered Justin's second bond for $\$ 20,000$ (bond number 3), to be forfeited and a bench warrant was issued for $\$ 10,000$ cash only.

Subsequently to this hearing, the clerk discovered the already existing $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant that was not entered into the system. Once the $\$ 10,000$ cash only warrant was entered correctly into the system, the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant was discovered. According to the Docket the $\$ 10,000$ cash only warrant would not issue and the $\$ 50,000$ did after June 10 , not March $21^{\text {st. }}$. The Court should correct the record to reflect this.

Again, this is the clerical errors on the part of the Court's not Justin's. The $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant should have been entered into the system correctly, which is of no fault of Justin's and he should not be punished because of it.

Moreover, the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant was not posted after defendant's failure to
appear on the $18^{\text {th }}$ day of March, 2014 until approximately 90 days after March 18 , certainly no within the 45 day statutory time period. NRS $178.508(1)$ (b). The error was discovered after the June 10, 2014, hearing. The docket reflects that the warrant was posted on March 21, 2014, which is not correct and must be corrected. The clerical errors are not Justin's fault and must be fixed, which will absolve Justin of any wrongdoing. It is of the utmost importance that the record reflects accurately the history of this case. Not to do so, the inaccuracies may be held against the defendant unfairly, and this type of situation can never be allowed to happen in our criminal justice system. This Court must correct its clerical errors.

## III. LEGAL AUTHORITY

Pursuant to NRS $178.509(1)($ b) (4), is written in pertinent part,
" 1 . If the defendant fails to appear when the defendant's presence in court is lawfully required, the court shall not exonerate the surety before the date of forfeiture prescribed in NRS 178.508 unless:
(4) Is being detained by civil or military authorities..." (emphasis added)

Surely, this Court now realizes that when defendant's release was revoked and when defendant was remanded, Justin no longer had custody or jurisdiction over the defendant, and his $\$ 25,000$ bond at that time ceases to exist, therefore any forfeitures or judgments thereafter are void as a matter of law.

The Nevada Supreme Court has previously stated that in construing statutes, "the first great object of the courts ... [is] to place such construction upon them as will carry out the manifest purpose of the legislature...." Thomas y. State, 88 Nev, $382,384,498$ P. $2 \mathrm{~d} 1314,1315$ (1972). In other situations, substantial compliance has validated statutory notice despite technical, non-prejudicial errors. See Harris v. State, 104 Nev. 246, 247, 756 P.2d 556, 556 (1988). In the instant case, adherence to the specified statutory authority is essential to effectuating the legislature's enactment of a 'bright line' rule.

In construing statutes, "shall" is presumptively mandatory and "may" is construed as permissive unless legislative intent demands another construction. Givens v. State, 99 Nev. 50 ,

54, 657 P. $2 \mathrm{~d} 97,233$ (1983); Thomas v. State, 88 Nev. 382, 384, 498 P.2d 1314, 1315 (1972).
At the very moment the pretrial services revoked defendant's release and remanded him, he is "...being detained by civil authorities...", which automatically exonerates the bond in question by operation of law. The clerical errors in this case are clearly erroneous and must be corrected.

The Nevada Supreme Court in International Fidelity Insurance v. State, 122 Nev. 39, 126 P. 3 d 1133 (Nev. 2006), has opined "In a district court's decision in a bail bond proceeding is typically based on factual determinations made by the district court, and the reviewing court will not disturb a district court's findings of fact unless they are clearly erroneous and not based on substantial evidence." In this case, the substantial evidence is that this Court clearly revoked defendant's bond and remanded him to custody, as evidenced by the new bail set. All other entries are erroneous as to the forfeiture, judgment, and the issuing of the $\$ 50,000$ cash only not being posted in a timely manner. The facts presented herein has demonstrated that the entries and record does not reflect the correct history of this case and therefore, must be corrected

Exoneration of a bail bond when another is posted in place of it, whether before or after forfeiture, must automatically happen and does at the Justice Court level by the bond clerk who handles the exonerations and forfeitures; therefore, this Court must reconsider its decision, enter an order exonerating the bond and set aside the judgment entered in this case as moot, and correct the record to reflect the true history so as to not prejudice this Court against either the defendant or Justin.

The Nevada Supreme Court has held that the requirement in NRS 178.508 should be strictly construed. Harris v. State, 104 Nev. 46 (1988). Furthermore, in the International Fidelity Insurance v. State, the Supreme Court stated in pertinent part,
"... In our previous decisions reviewing district court orders entered in bail bond proceedings, we have applied an abuse of discretion standard of review. ${ }^{1}$
${ }^{1}$ See Intl Fidelity. 114 Nev. 1061,967 P. 2 d 804 (applying a manifest abuse of discretion standard of review to an appeal from an order denying a motion to exonerate a bail bond); State of Nevada v. Americon Bankers Lns., $106 \mathrm{Nev} .880,802$ P. 2 d 127 d

Typically, a district court's decision in a bail bond proceeding will be based on factual determinations made by the district court. In the appellate context, this court will not disturb a district court's findings of fact unless they are clearly erroneous and not based on substantial evidence. ${ }^{2}$ Thus, if the district court's findings are supported by substantial evidence, then the district court has generally not abused its discretion in ruling on a bail bond matter."

In the instant case, the Court did not support its decision by any factual determination other than when the bonds were posted, and went further to say that "Justin has not attempted to surrender his bond". (Order; p.2, In: 6). The facts of this case as stated in this Court's order are correct to a point, however as stated herein the record must be corrected to reflect what has been pointed out in this motion, such as revoking the bond, not timely posting the $\$ 50,000$ cash only warrant, etc. Surely, when a new bail is set and a new bond replaces the original bond, the first bond is void as a matter of law. Justin no longer had jurisdiction to surrender the defendant or his bond. The Court placed the onus on WCSO and Bonafide by its own volition.

The surety and the bail agent should have been exonerated under common law defenses. "a bail bond is a contract between the State and the surety of the accused." All Star Bonding $v$. State, 119 Nev. 47, 49, 62 P.3d 1124, 1125 (2003) (quoting State v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 97 Nev. 34, 35, 0623 P.2d 976, 976 (1981).

Because the statutes governing bail bonds are incorporated into the agreement of the parties, interpreting the language of the bail bond statute is of utmost importance. NRS 178.509(1) states that "the court shall not exonerate the surety before the date of forfeiture prescribed in NRS 178.508 unless" one of the five conditions listed in the statute is present; "...being detained by civil authoritics..." NRS 178.509(1)(b)(4). (Emphasis added)
(1990) (applying an abuse of discretion standard of review to an appeal from an order exonerating bail bonds); Surety Midland $97 \mathrm{Nev} .108,625$ P. 2 d .90 (applying an abuse of discretion standard of review to an appeal from a denial of a motion to set aside the forfeiture of a bail bond).
${ }^{2}$ Guaranty Nat'l Ins. Co. v. Potter, 112 Nev. 199, 206, 912 P.2d 267, 272 (1996) (quoting Nevada Ins. Guaranty v. Sierra Auto Cfr., 108 Nev. 1123, 1126, 844 P.2d 126, 128 (1992)); Beverly Enterprises v. Globe Land Corp., 90 Nev. 363, 365, 526 P.2d 1179, 1180 (1974).

Furthermore, a court should presume that the legislature intended to use words in their usual and natural meaning. Thus, under a plain reading of the text, NRS 178.509 (1)(b)(4) allows the courts to exonerate a bond when the defendant was remanded to custody of the Washoe County Sheriff's Department. Therefore, to issue forfeiture on a bond that no longer exits is equal to taking the bond erroneously.

The words of a statute should be given their plain meaning unless this violates the spirit of the act. McKay v. Bd. of Supervisor's, 102 Nev. 644, 648, 730 P.2d 438, 441 (1986). Furthermore, a court should presume that the legislature intended to use words in their usual and natural meaning. Anthony Lee R., A Minor v. State, 113 Nev. 1406, 1414, 952 P.2d 1, 6 (1997) ("the plain meaning of a statute's words are presumed to reflect the legislature's intent").

The phrase "being detained by civil or military authorities" is not defined in NRS Chapter 178 , but its meaning is not difficult to decipher. The provision plainly speaks to circumstances where the defendant is in the custody or detention of some civil authority. More technically, the term "detain" is defined as "to hold or keep in or as if in custody" or "to restrain esp[ecially] from proceeding: STOP." Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary 345 (9th ed.1983). It is wholly unfair and unjust to forfeit the bail bond when the surety, through no fault of its own, is legally prevented from retrieving the defendant. The defendant was already in custody on the above-referenced bond and it should have been exonerated automatically, but forfeiture happened instead.

In the Nevada Supreme Court previous decisions reviewing district court orders entered in bail bond proceedings, they have applied an abuse of discretion standard of review. ${ }^{3}$ Typically, a district court's decision in a bail bond proceeding will be based on factua determinations made by the district court. In the appellate context, the court will not disturb a district court's findings of fact unless they are clearly erroneous and not based on substantial
evidence. ${ }^{3}$ (Emphasis added). In Justin's opinion, he did not have jurisdiction to surrender the defendant or to surrender the bond. Defendant's release and subsequently the bond was revoked, therefore the bond does not exit that moment and forfeiture and judgment are moot as a matter of law.

Thus, if the district court's findings are supported by substantial evidence, then the district court has generally not abused its discretion in ruling on a bail bond matter. In this case however, this Honorable Court has overlooked the plain meaning of NRS 178.509(1)(b)(4), when the defendant was remanded to custody, that automatically relieved Justin from all liability on the instant bond, and therefore it must be exonerated; however, of the utmost importance, is correcting the record, the cash only warrant did not post on March 21, 2014. It was los somewhere in the judicial system until after the June $10^{\text {th }}$ arraignment, then the $\$ 10,000$ cash only was inserted as it "will not issue". Surely this Court understands that it cannot forfeit on two bonds for the same person, for the same crime in the total amount of $\$ 45,000$, which is excessive. The proper bail amount to forfeit on according to the defendant's charges, sales of a controlled substance is $\$ 20,000$, not $\$ 45,000$. Justin agrees that his second bond for $\$ 20,000$ is correctly under forfeiture status and he is currently looking for the defendant.

The provisions of NRS 178.506-516 address forfeiture of bail bonds due to breach of a bond condition by a defendant or failure of a defendant to make a court appearance. NRS 178.512 sets forth certain conditions under which a court shall set aside forfeiture and order return of the forfeited money to the surety. The statute does not specifically address any period of limitation within which a surety must apply for a return of forfeiture. However, despite the legislative restrictions placed upon courts, the Nevada Supreme Court has held: "The decision to grant exoneration or discharge of a bond rests with the discretion of the trial judge, as long as the

[^2]sureties do not aid in the defendant's absence." State v. American Bankers Ins., 106 Nev. 880 , 883, 802 P. 2d 1276 (1990)(citing NRS 178.512).

It is considered a general principle of law that the court disfavors forfeiture. Forfeiture and the subsequent payment for failing to return a defendant to the court must never be considered as a source of revenue; the primary purpose of the criminal justice system is punishing those who break the laws, so as to dissuade future criminal acts, with the ultimate intent of reducing crime in society. Thus, the bail agent must be afforded every reasonable consideration that assists in fulfilling the obligation to the court of returning defendant. In this case, the defendant was already in custody; therefore Justin did not have to surrender either the defendant or his bond. By surrendering the bond with suretyship belonging to Bonafide, would have been prejudicial to the defendant. Surrendering the bond is a moot point.

This Honorable Court has the inherent authority to correct its clerical errors in any case based upon statutory and case authority cited herein. In this case, there are numerous clerical errors that began on February 3, 2014 as discussed herein. The bond clerk should have known that pretrial services revoked defendant's release thereby revoking Justin's bond and it should have been exonerated, thereby relieving him and the surety of all liability in this case. After that moment, all other clerical errors such as the forfeiture and the judgment are moot and cannot exist. Therefore, this Court must correct its errors and absolve Justin of any wrongdoing in the instant matter.

Pursuant to NRCP 60 (a) and (b)(1) and (b)(4), is written in pertinent part,
"Clerical mistakes in judgments, orders or other parts of the record and errors therein arising from oversight or omission may be corrected by the court at any time of its own initiative, or on the motion of any party and after such notice";
"the court may relieve a party or a party's legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: (1) mistake..."; and (4) the judgment is void...".

WHEREFORE, the Real Parties in Interest pray that this Honorable Court grant this Motion in its entirety and for any further relief this Court deems just and proper in the premises.

Dated this $\qquad$ day of October 2014.
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## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that the foregoing document in the above entitled case was served on this 23 day of October, 2014 on all parties to this action by:
and mailing in the an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope placed for collection business practices.
personal delivery
Facsimile (FAX)
Federal Express or other overnight delivery
Messenger Service
Certified Mail with Return Receipt Requested.
addressed as follows:
Deputy District Attorney Terrance Shea
Washoe County District Attorney
1 South Sierra Street, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Reno, NV
AFFIRMATION: The undersigned hereby affirms that this document does not contain any social security numbers of any person Pursuant to NRS 239B.030.

DATED this $\lambda 2$ day of October 2014.
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## EXHIBIT LISTS

DESCRIPTION
09-13-13 WCSO Booking Recap 01-31-14 WCSO Booking Recap 05-14-14 WCSO Booking Recap

43
Page 15 of 15

## EXHIBIT 1

## EXHIBIT 1
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Washoe County Jail

## Inmate Booking Information Form



## Qhalefent

## noc/charge

Charge Hera
RESIST PUB OFF
count

RENO JUSTICE COURT 4801 WA Waman Agency | FCA |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| WAS 0001252 C | $\$ 500.00$ |

Remarks
JUSTIN BROS BAIL BONDS

## SHALE

NOCIChatgo
51127

Court
RENO JUSTICE COURT



WCAS0001252C $\quad \$ 5,000.00$
Remarks
JUSTIN BROS BAIL BONDS

## (-7Aghere

NOCHCharge
51137
Count
Charge Literal
POSS $<=1$ OZ MARIJUANA, 1ST
RENO JUSTICE COURT
Warrant No

RESTRICTED INFORMATION 15 PROHIBITED.

WCAS0001252C $\$ 500.00$

Remarks
JUSTIN BROS BAIL: BONDS

Douglewis bail Bonds
 By: $2014266 \quad 45$

| Washoe County Jail |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inmate Booking Information Form |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Noc/Change } \\ & 51093 \end{aligned}$ |  | ChatgeLigralSELI SCH I OR II $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{S}, 2 \mathrm{ND}$ |  |  |
| Col <br> RENO JUSTIICE COURT |  |  |  | 3599NV |
|  |  |  |  | $13-5736$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| PCN PCAS 0001252 C |  |  |  |  |
| Rentarks <br> JUSTIN BROS BAIL BONDS |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## EXHIBIT 2

## EXHIBIT 2



UNLANEUL DISSEMINATION UH THS
RESTRICTED INFORMATION IS PROHBITED.
VIOLATION WILL SUBJECT THE OFFENDER
TO CRIMINAL AND CIVH. LIABHLTY R Cant Hide
REL TO: Doug Lewis@ RunCanthide
DATE: $\quad 10 / 21 / 14$
WASHOE COUNTY ZSERIFF'S OFFICE

BY: $工 4266$


If I am released on my Own Recognizance, or by bail posted, I hereby promise to appear in the Court, and on the date and time, that are shown on the charges indicated above with the court name, address, appearance date, and appearance time printed with each. I am fully aware that my Failure to Appear to any of the above mentioned dates will result in my arrest, and an additional charge being placed against me. If I should leave the Court's Jurisdiction, I hereby waive all rights and any formal requirements that relate to extradition proceedings; and further, I will be responsible for any and all expenses relating to my return to this jurisdiction.

I further acknowledge that I understand that any Court of competent jurisdiction may revoke this order of release without bail, without notice, and may order me into custody or require me to furnish bail, or otherwise, in order to ensure my appearance.

Release Prepared By
Defendant's Signature $\qquad$
Sergeant's Signature


## EXHIBIT 3

## EXHIBIT 3



UNLAWHUL DISSEMINATION OF THIS RESTRICTED INFORMATION IS PROHBBTED. VIOLATION WHL SUBJECT THE OFFENDER TO CRMMINAL AND CIVM LIABLLTYRun Can't H'de REL TO: Doug Lewis a riai bonds DATE: $10 / 21 / 14$ WHSHOE COUNIV SHERIFF'S OFFICE
BY: ... $20 \quad 4266$



If I am released on my Own Recognizance, or by bail posted, I hereby promise to appear in the Court, and on the date and time, that are shown on the charges indicated above with the court name, address, appearance date, and appearance time printed with each. I am fully aware that my Failure to Appear to any of the above mentioned dates will result in my arrest, and an additional charge being placed against me. If I should leave the Court's Jurisdiction, I hereby waive all. rights and any formal requirements that relate to extradition proceedings; and further, $I$ will be responsible for any and all expenses relating to my return to this jurisdiction.

I further acknowledge that I understand that any Court of competent jurisdiction may revoke this order of release without bail, without notice, and may order me into custody or require me to furnish bail, or otherwise, in order to ensure my appearance.

Release Prepared By
Defendant's Signature $\qquad$
Sergeant's Signature



## Wash oe County Jail

## Inmate Release Information Form



If I am released on my Own Recognizance, or by bail. 1 posted, I hereby promise to appear in the court, and on the date and time, that are shown on the charges indicated above with the court name, address, appearance date, and appearance time printed with each. I am fully aware that my Failure to Appear to any of the above mentioned dates will result in my arrest, and an additional charge being placed against me. If I should leave the Court's Jurisdiction, I hereby waive all rights and any formal requirements that relate to extradition proceedings; and further, $I$ will be responsible for any and all expenses relating to my return to this jurisdiction.

I further acknowledge that I understand that any court of competent jurisdiction may revoke this order of release without bail, without notice, and may order me into custody or require me to furnish bail, or otherwise, in order to ensure my appearance.

Release Prepared By

Defendant's Signature $\qquad$

Sergeant's Signature



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ That is, the October 23,2014 motion actually was properly brought under NRCP 60 (b) (4). Based on the above, when Dupree was remanded into custody - in this case, twice - by operation of law the within bond had to be exonerated. Any other order, or continuation of the bail, was void as a matter of law. Accordingly, the fact that Justin Bros didn't bring this motion "as quickly as it could have" is legally irrelevant. A void order or proceeding can be challenged at any time. See: Moore v. Moore, 75 Nev. 189, 193-94, n. 2, 336 P. 2d 1073 (1959).

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Dupree has not been booked by the Washoe County Sheriff's Department on this warrant.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Guaranty Nat'Ins. Co. v. Potter, 112 Nev. 199, 206, 912 P. 2d 267, 272 (1996) (quoting Nevada Ins. Guaranty v. Sierra Auto C(t. 108 Nev. 1123, 1126,844 P.2d 126, 128 (1992)); Beverly Enterpurises v. Globe Land Coro, 90 Nev, $363,365,526$ P. 2 d

