Electronically Filed Jan 21 2016 02:45 p.m. Tracie K. Lindeman

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ESTATE OF MICHAEL DAVID
ADAMS, BY AND THROUGH HIS
MOTHER JUDITH ADAMS, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON
INDIVIDUALLY AND ON '
BEHALF OF THE ESTATE,

Appellant,

v.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SUSAN FALLINI,

Respondent.

Supreme Court No.: 68033

District Court Case No.: CV24539

## MOTION FOR ACCEPTANCE AND REVIEW OF VIDEO EXHIBIT

Appellant Judith Adams, Individually and on Behalf of The Estate of Michael David Adams, ("Appellant"), by and through her attorney of record, John P. Aldrich, Esq. of the Aldrich Law Firm, Ltd., hereby moves this Court to accept and review a video exhibit. The video exhibit is a video recording of a hearing that occurred on July 28, 2014, which Plaintiff's counsel obtained directly from the Nye County Clerk's Office, and which is part of the district court's record.

Around May 20, 2014, Defendant/Respondent filed a Motion for Relief from Judgment Pursuant to NRCP 60(b), alleging Plaintiff's counsel committed fraud on the Court. Plaintiff opposed, and a hearing was held on July 28, 2014. Prior to the hearing on July 28, 2014, Defendant and/or her counsel rounded up dozens of friends and ranchers to attend the hearing.

While the transcript advises this Court of what was said at the July 28, 2014 hearing, the subject video shows what a transcript cannot - dozens of ranchers pouring into the courtroom and "observing" court proceedings, in what Plaintiff

believes was an attempt to inappropriately influence the Court and intimidate Plaintiff's counsel. Simply reading the transcript does not allow the Court to gauge the reality and gravity of the situation; the Court must view for itself the video from that day. Plaintiff asserts that the video is a necessary part of the trial record that the Court should review. See NRAP 10(a)(1).

Following the July 28, 2014 hearing, on or about August 6, 2014, the district court granted Defendant's motion, despite the fact that this Court had already ruled on the issues before the district court that day.

Therefore, Respondents respectfully request that the Court accept and review the video of the July 28, 2014 hearing. This Motion is submitted in good faith and in an attempt to ensure that the Court is fully apprised of everything that occurred in proceedings in the district court.

DATED this 21st day of January, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

## ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.

/s/ John P. Aldrich John P. Aldrich, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 6877 1601 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 160 Las Vegas, NV 89146 (702) 853-5490 (702) 227-1975 Attorneys for Appellant

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing MOTION FOR ACCEPTANCE

AND REVIEW OF VIDEO EXHIBIT was filed electronically with the Nevada

Supreme Court on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2016.

I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and correct copy thereof, postage prepaid, addressed to:

David R. Hague Fabian & Clendenin 215 S. State Street, Suite 1200 Salt Lake City, UT 84111-2323 Attorney for

> /s/ E. Engebretson An employee of Aldrich Law Firm, Ltd.