

1 **In the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada**

2

3

4 **Leslie Lynn Miller,**

5 Appellant,

6 vs.

7 **Brett Robert Miller,**

8 Respondent.

9

Electronically Filed
Sep 30 2016 08:18 a.m.
Supreme Ct. Case No. 69353
Trace K. Lindeman
District Ct. Case Clerk of Supreme Court

10 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

11 I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 29th day of September, 2016, I served
12 a true and correct copy of the "Order Regarding Pro Bono Counsel," filed in
13 the above-captioned case upon the following, in the following manner(s):

14 X by U.S. mail in Henderson, Nevada, pursuant to NRCP 5(b)(2)(B),
15 with First-Class postage prepaid and addressed as follows:

16 **Brett Robert Miller**
17 10521 Hartford Hills Ave.
18 Las Vegas, Nevada 89166
19 Respondent in Proper Person

Brett Robert Miller
 8921 Sally Rose Avenue
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89149
 Respondent in Proper Person

20 

21 **Kimberly Nixon**
22 An employee of Pecos Law Group

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LESLIE LYNN MILLER,
Appellant,
vs.
BRETT ROBERT MILLER,
Respondent.

No. 69353

FILED

SEP 28 2016

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER REGARDING PRO BONO COUNSEL


This is an appeal from a divorce decree and determination of child support. Respondent is proceeding without legal representation in this appeal. Having considered the documents transmitted by the district court and appellant's fast track statement, this court has determined that the appointment of pro bono counsel to represent respondent would assist this court in reviewing this appeal. By this order, the court expresses no opinion as to the merits of this appeal.

Pro bono counsel is an attorney who provides legal services without charge for the benefit of the public good. The appointment of pro bono counsel provides attorneys with an opportunity to volunteer legal services in furtherance of their professional responsibility and, at the same time, allows financially eligible litigants access to quality legal representation without cost. Counsel will be appointed for purposes of this appeal only and will participate in oral argument. Currently, the Pro Bono Committee of the Appellate Litigation Section of the State Bar of Nevada (Pro Bono Committee), in conjunction with the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, has developed a pro bono appellate program to assist the public and this court. This case is hereby referred to the program

established by the Pro Bono Committee to evaluate whether respondent can benefit from the program.

Accordingly, we direct the clerk of this court to transmit a copy of this order and the attached case summary to the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada for financial eligibility screening. If respondent qualifies and does not object to pro bono counsel, the Legal Aid Center in cooperation with the Pro Bono Committee shall locate a volunteer attorney from the program to represent respondent. Once an attorney is located, the attorney shall file a notice of appearance in this court within 60 days from the date of this order. Supplemental briefing and oral argument will be scheduled thereafter. Alternatively, if respondent is not financially eligible or objects to pro bono representation, or if a volunteer attorney cannot be located, the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada shall notify this court in writing within 60 days from the date of this order. In such case, oral argument will not be held, and this matter will remain with respondent proceeding in pro se.

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

cc: Pecos Law Group
Brett Robert Miller
Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Barbara E. Buckley,
Executive Director
Anne R. Traum, Coordinator, Appellate Litigation Section,
Pro Bono Committee, State Bar of Nevada
Kelly Dove

Docket No. 69353 – *Miller v. Miller*

Appellant and respondent entered into an agreement concerning their divorce and child custody. The parties agreed to share primary physical custody of one child but that appellant would have primary physical custody of the other. The parties did not reach an agreement as to child support. The district court entered a determination of child support. Appellant argues that there is no established formula for determining child support in situations where the custody arrangement is different for each child.