

MARK E. FERRARIO (1625)
GREENBERG TRAUIG, LLP
3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
Suite 400 North
Las Vegas, Nevada 89136
Tel: (702) 792-3773
Fax: (702) 792-9002
Email: FerrarioM@gtlaw.com
Counsel for Appellant SHAC, LLC

Electronically Filed
Oct 27 2016 04:43 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

WILLIAM H. BROWN (7623)
LAMBROSE | BROWN PLLC
300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 816-2200
Fax: (702) 816-2300
Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com
*Counsel for all Petitioners
except SHAC, LLC*

**SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint
Rhino Gentlemen's Club, et al.,

Appellants,

vs.

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
TAXATION**, et al.,

Respondents.

Supreme Court Docket: 69886

District Court Case: A-11-648894-J
Consolidated with A-14-697515-J

Appellants' Appendix

APPELLANTS' APPENDIX
VOLUME 18, PAGES 3758 – 4006

INDEX TO APPELLANTS' APPENDIX

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page																
06/24/2016	Amended Notice of Appeal	19	4036-4038																
06/23/2016	Amended Order Denying Judicial Review of Administrative Decision	19	4021-4026																
09/28/2011	<p>Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission</p> <p>Exhibit 13 (ONLY) – Department Letter of November 17, 20013 Re: Southern California Edison</p> <p>(This exhibit was erroneously omitted in the Supplement to the Record Filed on January 26, 2015)</p>	1	13-15																
01/26/2015	<p>Entire Record of Administrative Proceedings Filed with District Court via Compact Disc (District Court Case No. A-11-648894-J):</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission, dated 09/28/11</td><td>1-30</td><td>1</td><td>140-169</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ex. 1 – Charts by the Department showing LET Collections by Taxpayer Group.</td><td>31-34</td><td>1</td><td>170-173</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ex. 2 – March 14, 2005, Department memo discussing the specific inclusion of gentlemen's clubs in the proposed amended version of Chapter 368A.</td><td>35-37</td><td>1</td><td>174-176</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ex. 3 – October 9, 2003, email to former Department Director Dino</td><td>38-43</td><td>1</td><td>177-182</td></tr> </table>	Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission, dated 09/28/11	1-30	1	140-169	Ex. 1 – Charts by the Department showing LET Collections by Taxpayer Group.	31-34	1	170-173	Ex. 2 – March 14, 2005, Department memo discussing the specific inclusion of gentlemen's clubs in the proposed amended version of Chapter 368A.	35-37	1	174-176	Ex. 3 – October 9, 2003, email to former Department Director Dino	38-43	1	177-182		
Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission, dated 09/28/11	1-30	1	140-169																
Ex. 1 – Charts by the Department showing LET Collections by Taxpayer Group.	31-34	1	170-173																
Ex. 2 – March 14, 2005, Department memo discussing the specific inclusion of gentlemen's clubs in the proposed amended version of Chapter 368A.	35-37	1	174-176																
Ex. 3 – October 9, 2003, email to former Department Director Dino	38-43	1	177-182																

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page
	DiCianno from an attorney on behalf of the Bellagio hotel and casino discussion the constitutionality of the proposed amendments.		
	Ex. 4 – October 21, 2003, email to DiCianno with a transcript of the Nevada Gaming Commission discussing the importance of subjecting the gentlemen’s clubs to the LET.	44-67	1 183-206
	Ex. 5 – First Reprint of Senate Bill 247 which contains a counsel digest specifically referencing adult entertainment and what would happen if that proposed portion of the Bill were held unconstitutional.	68-92	1 207-231
	Ex. 6 – Minutes of the May 16, 2005, meeting of the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor which discusses what happens if the proposed live adult entertainment provisions are held unconstitutional.	93-110	1 232-249
	Ex. 7 – Minutes of the May 26, 2005, meeting of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, which specifically references the Department’s position on there being two distinct categories: live entertainment and live adult entertainment. Exhibit E to the minutes is an email from DiCianno setting forth this distinction.	111-118	2 250-257

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page
	Ex. 8 – Untitled Revenue Analysis.	119-121	258-260
	Ex. 9 – November 9, 2004, Memo to Chinnock, Executive Director of Department.	122	261
	Ex. 10 – April 24, 2004, DiCianno Email.	123	262
	Ex. 11 – November 18, 2003, Barbara Smith Campbell Email.	124-125	263-264
	Ex. 12 – Minutes of June 5, 2005, Meeting of Senate Committee on Taxation.	126-137	265-276
	Ex. 14 – <u>Deja Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas, L.L.C., v. Nevada Dept. of Taxation</u> , 2006 WL 2161980 (D. Nev. July 28, 2006) – dismissal of lawsuit.	138-141	277-280
	Ex. 15 – Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint, Document 12, U.S.D.C. Nevada, Case No. 2:06-cv-00480, filed May 10, 2006.	142-153	281-292
	Ex. 16 – Reply to Motion to Dismiss Complaint, Document 17, U.S.D.C. Nevada, Case No. 2:06-cv-00480, filed June 14, 2006.	154-165	293-304
	8 th Judicial District Court Administrative Record, filed 10/21/11		
	(Index of Documents)	166-170	306-309

Filing Date	Description			Vol.	Page
	Petitioner's Claims for Refund of Tax on Live Entertainment, February 27, 2007 (Tax Period: January 2004)	1-41	171-211	2	310-350
	Petitioners' Claim for Refund of Tax on Live Entertainment, March 28, 2007 (Tax Period: February 2004)	42-84	212-254	2	351-393
	Respondent's Response to Refund Requests, April 3, 2007	85-96	255-266	2	394-405
	Petitioners' Claims for Refund of Tax on Live Entertainment, April 26, 2007 (Tax Period: March 2004)	97-139	267-309	2	406-448
	Respondent's Response to Refund Requests, April 30, 2007	140-145	310-315	2	449-454
	Petitioners' Claims for Refund of Tax on Live Entertainment, May 30, 2007 (Tax Period: April 2004)	146-188	316-358	2	455-497
	Respondent's Response to Refund Requests, June 4, 2007	189-194	359-364	3	498-503
	Petitioners' Formal Notice of Appeal, May 1, 2007 (The following pages in this section were intentionally left blank)	195-273	365-443	3	504-582
	Petitioners' Correspondence Regarding Amended Notice of Hearing, June 19, 2007	274-276	444-446	3	583-585

Filing Date	Description			Vol.	Page
	Respondents' Amended Notice of Hearing, June 8, 2007	277-280	447-450	3	586-589
	Respondents' Notice of Hearing, June 7, 2007	281-284	451-454	3	590-593
	Bradley J. Shafer Formal Notice of Appearance, June 8, 2007	285-286	455-456	3	594-595
	Petitioners' Correspondence Regarding Notice of Appeal of Denial of Claim for Refund, June 21, 2007	287-333	457-503	3	596-642
	Department's Brief and Exhibits in Support of the Department's Denial of Appellant's Refund Requests, June 15, 2007	334-351	504-521	3	643-660
	Appellants' Reply Brief and Exhibits in Opposition to the Nevada Department of Taxation's Denial of Appellant's Refund Requests	352-387	522-557	3	661-696
	Department's Supplemental Brief in Support of the Department's Denial of Appellant's Refund Requests	388-392	558-562	3	697-701
	Department's Power Point Presentation	393-415	563-585	3	702-724
	Department's Appendix of Cases, Statutes and Other Authorities				
	(Index of Appendix)	416-418	586-588	3	725-727

Filing Date	Description			Vol.	Page
	Appendix 1 – Sheriff v. Burdg	419-426	589-596	3	728-735
	Appendix 2 – Cashman Photo Concessions and Labs v. Nevada Gaming Commission	427-432	597-602	3	736-741
	Appendix 3 – List v. Whisler	433-441	603-611	4	742-750
	Appendix 4 – Whitehead v. Comm’n on Judicial Discipline	442-482	612-652	4	751-791
	Appendix 5 – Murdock v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	483-493	653-663	4	792-802
	Appendix 6 – Jimmy Swaggart Ministries v. Board of Equalization	494-509	664-679	4	803-818
	Appendix 7 – Minneapolis Star v. Minnesota Comm’r of Revenue	510-530	680-700	4	819-839
	Appendix 8 – Adams Outdoor Advertising v. Borough of Stroudsburg	531-546	701-716	4	840-855
	Appendix 9 – Ward v. Rock Against Racism	547-568	717-738	4	856-877
	Appendix 10 – Leathers v. Medlock	569-586	739-756	4	878-895

Filing Date	Description			Vol.	Page
	Appendix 11 – Madden v. Kentucky	587-596	757-766	4	896-905
	Appendix 12 – Forbes v. City of Seattle	597-612	767-782	4	906-921
	Appendix 13 – Simon & Schuster, Inc. v. Members of New York State Crime Victims Board	613-630	783-800	4	922-939
	Appendix 14 – City of Las Angeles v. Alameda Books, Inc.	631-651	801-821	4	940-960
	Appendix 15 – California Highway Patrol v. Superior Court	652-668	822-838	4	961-977
	Appendix 16 – Vermont Society of Assoc. Executives v. Milne	669-680	839-850	4	978-989
	Appendix 17 – Comptroller of the Treasury v. Clyde’s of Chevy Chase, Inc.	681-704	851-874	5	990-1013
	Appendix 18 – Chapter 368A	705-720	875-890	5	1014-1029
	Appendix 19 – IRC §§ 4231 through 4234	721-727	891-897	5	1030-1036
	Appendix 20 – Nevada State Attorney General Opinion No. 85-17	728-733	898-903	5	1037-1042

Filing Date	Description			Vol.	Page
	Appendix 21 – Committee Notes regarding S.B. 497, June 6, 1995	734-746	904-916	5	1043-1055
	Petitioners’ Correspondence Regarding Supplemental Material Submitted for Appeal	747-749	917-919	5	1056-1058
	Petitioners’ Power Point Presentation	750-787	920-957	5	1059-1096
	Supplemental Submission on Behalf of Taxpayers/Appellants				
	Index	788-792	958-962	5	1097-1101
	1. Arkansas Writers Project, Inc. v. Charles D. Ragland	793-803	963-973	5	1102-1112
	2. Grosjean v. American Press Co.	804-812	974-982	5	1113-1121
	3. Jimmy Swaggard Ministries v. Board of Equalization of California	813-826	983-996	5	1122-1135
	4. Leathers v. Medlock	827-843	997-1013	5	1136-1152
	5. Minneapolis Star and Tribune Company v. Minnesota Commissioners of Revenue	844-863	1014-1033	5	1153-1172
	6. Murdock v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	864-872	1034-1042	5	1173-1181

Filing Date	Description			Vol.	Page
	7. Regan v. Taxation with Representation of Washington and Taxation with Representation of Washington v. Donald T. Regan	873-884	1043-1054	5	1182-1193
	8. City of Las Angeles v. Alameda Books, Inc.	885-907	1055-1077	5	1194-1216
	9. TK’s Video, Inc. v. Denton County, Texas	908-935	1078-1105	6	1217-1244
	Theresa Enterprises, Inc. v. United State of America	936-949	1106-1119	6	1245-1258
	10. Festival Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Pleasant Hill	950-954	1120-1124	6	1259-1263
	11. United Artists Communications, Inc. v. City of Montclair	955-960	1125-1130	6	1264-1269
	12. Vermont Society of Association Executives v. James Milne	961-982	1131-1152	6	1270-1291
	13. Church of the Lukumi Babalu Ave, Inc. v. City of Hialeah	983-1017	1153-1187	6	1292-1326
	14. City of LaDue v. Margaret Gilleo	1018-1029	1188-1199	6	1327-1338
	15. United States v. Eichman	1030-1039	1200-1209	6	1339-1348

Filing Date	Description			Vol.	Page
	16. Adams Outdoor Advertising v. Borough or Stroudsburg	1040-1052	1210-1222	6	1349-1361
	17. Forbes v. City of Seattle	1053-1066	1223-1236	6	1362-1375
	18. NRS 360.291	1067-1070	1237-1240	6	1376-1379
	19. NRS Chapter 368 A	1071-1086	1241-1256	6	1380-1395
	20. Excerpts of Minutes of Senate Committee on Taxation – May 26, 2003	1087-1090	1257-1260	6	1396-1399
	21. Excerpts of Senate Bill No. 8 – 2003 Nevada Laws 20 th Sp. Sess. Ch. 5 (S.B. 8)	1091-1109	1261-1279	6	1400-1418
	22. Adopted Regulation of the Nevada tax Commission – R212-03	1110-1122	1280-1292	6	1419-1431
	23. Excerpts of the Legislative History of A.B. 554-2005	1123-1146	1293-1316	6	1432-1455
	24. Excerpts of Minutes of the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor Meeting – May 16, 2005	1147-1162	1317-1332	7	1456-1471
	25. Senate Bill No. 3 – 2005 Nevada Laws 22 nd Sp. Sess. Ch. 9 (S.B. 3)	1163-1171	1333-1341	7	1472-1480

Filing Date	Description			Vol.	Page
	26. Assembly Bill No. 554 – 2005 Nevada Laws Ch. 484 (A.B. 554)	1172- 1179	1342- 1349	7	1481-1488
	27. Assembly Bill No. 487 – 2007 Nevada Laws Ch. 547 (A.B. 487)	1180- 1182	1350- 1352	7	1489-1491
	28. Nevada Department of Taxation Annual Report for Fiscal Years 2004- 2005 and 2005-2006	1183- 1187	1353- 1357	7	1492-1496
	29. Initial Request for Refund Letter (specimen copy)	1188- 1194	1358- 1364		1497-1503
	30. Nevada Tax Department’s Denials of Request for Refunds	1195- 1218	1365- 1388	7	1504-1527
	Transcript of the State of Nevada Tax Commission Teleconferenced Open Meeting, Monday, July 9, 2007	1219- 1237	1389- 1407	7	1528-1546
	Transcript of the State of Nevada Tax Commission Teleconferenced Open Meeting, Monday, August 6, 2007	1238- 1332	1408- 1502	7	1547-1641
	Commission’s Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law and Decision, October 12, 2007	1333- 1334	1503- 1504	7	1642-1643
	Petitioners’ Request for a Copy of the Nevada Tax Commission’s Formal	1335	1505	7	1644

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page
	Written Ruling, August 22, 2007		
	These Bates Numbered Pages Were Left Blank Intentionally: 202; 210; 218; 226; 234; 242; 250; 258; 266; 294; 309; 317; 318; and 326		
	Opposition to Petitioner's Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission, filed 10/21/11	1506-1555	7
	Reply in Support of Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission, filed 11/07/11	1556-1642	8
	Transcript of Hearing, dated 12/09/11	1643-1656	8
	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Petitioner's Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission, filed 02/02/12	1657-1662	8
	Document submitted by Taxpayer on Remand		
	A – Memorandum - Analysis of Revenue Impact	1663-1665	8
	B – Live Entertainment Tax by number of seats (2004)	1666-1668	8
	C – Department of Taxation Update Request	1669-1672	8
	D – Live Entertainment Tax information and press releases	1673-1681	8
			1645-1694
			1695-1781
			1782-1795
			1796-1801
			1802-1804
			1805-1807
			1808-1811
			1812-1820

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page
	(various dated and undated documents)		
	E – LET Updates, Southern Nevada, 7/19/04	1682-1683	8 1821-1822
	F – Live Entertainment Tax- Seating Capacity 300-7400, January-December 2004	1684-1685	8 1823-1824
	G – LET by venue (DV000028-blank page)	1686-1694	8 1825-1833
	H – LET by category and venue	1695-1699	8 1834-1838
	I – 10% LET- Gentleman's Clubs	1700-1703	8 1839-1842
	J – LET account summary	1704-1710	8 1843-1849
	K – Various Correspondence to and from taxpayers - December 10, 2003, December 12, 2003, May 17, 2005, April 2, 2007, January 3, 2008	1711-1720	8 1850-1859
	L – LET Tax received 2004- 2008	1721-1777	8 1860-1916
	M – LET Tax received fiscal year 2007	1778-1779	8 1917-1918
	N – Monthly deposit report, prepared April 17 2009	1780-1788	8 1919-1927
	O – General Fund Revenues, fiscal year 2005- 2008, forecast 2009 - 2011	1789-1790	8 1928-1929
	P – SB 247 Bill History	1791-1793	8 1930-1932

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page
	Q – Department of Taxation- "What You Need to Know About Nevada's Live Entertainment Tax" 10/21/03, 7/6/05 and 8/15/05 and PowerPoint presentation	1794-1855	9 1933-1994
	R – Seating capacity information by district	1856-1858	9 1995-1997
	S – LET tax information for LCB	1859-1862	9 1998-2001
	T – Memorandum regarding LET tax- 5/21/04	1863-1867	9 2002-2006
	U – LET tax seating capacity 300 - 7400, January - September 2004	1868-1869	9 2007-2008
	V – AB 281 information regarding LET	1870-1872	9 2009-2011
	W – Draft Regulations for discussions 8/25/03	1873-1881	9 2012-2020
	X – Changes effective July 2005	1882-1883	9 2021-2022
	Y – Public Notice September 5, 2003, proposed regulations	1884-1935	9 2023-2074
	Z – Memorandum and adopted regulations, December 7, 2003	1936-2007	9 2075-2146
	AA – Regulation, LCB File No. R1 05-05, February 23, 2006	2008-2055	10 2147-2194
	BB – Minutes of Senate Committee on Taxation June 5, 2005	2056-2135	10 2195-2274


Filing Date	Description		Vol.	Page
	CC – LET PowerPoint presentation	2136-2146	10	2275-2285
	DD – Public Notice September 26, 2003, proposed regulations	2147-2201	10	2286-2340
	EE – Public Notice October 23,2003 for meeting dated October 30, 2003	2202-2290	11	2341-2429
	FF – Public Notice October 24, 2003, proposed regulations	2291-2370	11	2430-2509
	GG – Notice of Public Meeting and Transcript of Public Meeting November 25, 2003	2371-2414	11	2510-2553
	HH – Nevada Tax Commission Meeting and Proposed Regulations - Posted November 19, 2003	2415-2496	12	2554-2635
	II – LET reports	2497-2512	12	2636-2651
	JJ – LET workshop- Compact Disc	2513-2514	12	2652-2653
	KK – Legislative History	2515-2569	12	2654-2708
	KK – Legislative History (Continued)	2570-2815	13	2709-2954
	KK – Legislative History (Continued)	2816-2856	14	2955-2995
	LET Updated Requests	2857-3064	14	2996-3203
	LET Updated Requests (Continued)	3065-3156	15	3204-3295
	LET PowerPoint	3157-3168	15	3296-3307

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page
	Letter from Petitioner's counsel to the Nevada Tax Commission re: NAC 360.135 Request for Subpoenas to Dino DiCianno, Michelle Jacobs, and Tesa Wanamaker, dated 06/14/12	3169-3173	15 3308-3312
	Letter from Respondent's counsel to the Nevada Tax Commission in opposition to the request for subpoenas, dated 06/15/12	3174-3179	15 3313-3318
	Letter from Petitioner's counsel to the Nevada Tax Commission in reply to Petitioner's opposition to the request for subpoenas, plus Exhibit A-B, dated 06/19/12	3180-3190	15 3319-3329
	Nevada Department of Taxation's Brief on Remand to Consider Additional Evidence, plus Exhibits A-G, dated 06/19/12	3191-3341	16 3330-3480
	Letter from Respondent's counsel to the Nevada Tax Commission re: Sur-Reply to the request for subpoenas, dated 06/20/12	3342-3373	16 3481-3512
	Letter from Petitioner's counsel to the Nevada Tax Commission re: Supplement to Reply to the request for subpoenas, dated 06/20/12	3374-3567	17 3513-3706
	Transcript of Nevada Tax Commission, 06/25/12	3658-3604	17 3707-3743
	Nevada Tax Commission Decision Letter, dated 09/06/12	3605-3610	17 3744-3749
	Hearing Officer's Order on Remand, dated 08/27/13	3611-3618	17 3750-3757
	Stipulation for Submission on the Record, 10/24/13	3619-3634	18 3758-3773
	Nevada Tax Commission Notice of Hearing, dated 11/22/13	3635-3636	18 3774-3775

Filing Date	Description		Vol.	Page
	Waiver of Notice, dated 11/22/13	3637	18	3776
	Transcript of Nevada Tax Commission (only the portions of Nevada Tax Commission relevant to this matter), 12/09/13	3638-3642	18	3777-3781
	Nevada Tax Commission's Decision, 02/12/14	3643-3718	18	3782-3857
12/09/2011	Minutes		1	48-49
12/16/2011	Minutes		1	50-51
06/08/2012	Minutes		1	84-85
09/22/2015	Minutes		18	3867-3868
10/27/2015	Minutes		18	3877-3878
11/24/2015	Minutes		18	3907-3909
10/15/2013	Minutes – Status Check		1	95-96
02/26/2016	Notice of Appeal		18	3934-4006
06/24/2016	Notice of Entry of Amended Order Denying Judicial Review of Administrative Decision		19	4027-4035
10/26/2011	Notice of Entry of Order		1	19-23
11/21/2011	Notice of Entry of Order		1	28-33
02/02/2012	Notice of Entry of Order		1	54-59
06/22/2012	Notice of Entry of Order		1	88-93
3/28/2014	Notice of Entry of Order		1	119-126

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page
02/04/2016	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Judicial Review of Administrative Decision	18	3921-3933
10/13/2015	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Petitioner's Motion to File Supplemental Brief and Setting Hearing on Petition for Judicial Review	18	3872-3876
03/31/2015	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Stipulation and Order to Extend Time	18	3861-3866
03/26/2014	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Consolidating Cases	1	111-118
01/22/2015	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time	1	130-134
06/27/2016	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Proposed Amended Order	19	4039-4055
01/15/2016	Order Denying Judicial Review of Administrative Decision	18	3911-3920
06/21/2012	Order Denying Stay	1	86-87
10/09/2015	Order Granting Petitioner's Motion to File Supplemental Brief and Setting Hearing on Petition for Judicial Review	18	3869-3871
02/01/2012	Order Granting Plaintiffs Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission	1	52-53
09/09/2013	Order Scheduling Status Check	1	94
12/02/2015	Order to Statistically Close Case	18	3910
09/23/2011	Petition for Judicial Review	1	1-12

Filing Date	Description	Vol.	Page
03/11/2014	Petition for Judicial Review (District Court Case No. A-14-697515-J)	1	97-106
03/24/2014	Stipulation and Order Consolidating Cases (Consolidating A-14-697515-J with A-11-648894-J)	1	107-110
11/21/2011	Stipulation and Order for Continuance	1	25-27
10/25/2011	Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time	1	16-18
01/21/2015	Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time	1	127-129
03/30/2015	Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time	18	3858-3860
06/23/2016	Stipulation and Proposed Amended Order	19	4007-4020
01/26/2015	Supplement to the Record on Appeal in Accordance with the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act (Entire Record - Index)	1	136-139
12/09/2011	Transcript (Entered on 10/30/2012 into District Court Case No. A-11-648894-J)	1	34-47
06/08/2012	Transcript (Entered on 10/30/2012 into District Court Case No. A-11-648894-J)	1	60-83
10/27/2015	Transcript of Proceedings Before the Honorable Jerry A. Wiese, II – October 27, 2015 (Re: Oral Argument on Petition for Judicial Review) (District Court Case No. A- 11-648894-J) (Entered into District Court Case No. A-14-697515-J)	18	3879-3906
01/26/2015	Transmittal of Supplement to the Record on Appeal	1	135



CLERK OF THE COURT

Electronically Filed
Mar 03 2016 01:18 p.m.
Tracie K. Lindeman
Clerk of Supreme Court

1 NOAS

2 WILLIAM H. BROWN (7623)

3 LAMBROSE | BROWN PLLC

4 300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700

5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

6 Tel: (702) 816-2200

7 Fax: (702) 816-2300

8 Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com

9 *Attorney for Petitioner,*

10 *K-Kel, Inc.*

11 BRADLEY J. SHAFER

12 Michigan Bar No. P36604

13 SHAFER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

14 3800 Capital City Blvd., Suite #2

15 Lansing, Michigan 48906-2110

16 Tel: (517) 886-6560

17 Fax: (517) 886-6565

18 Email: Brad@bradshaferlaw.com

19 *Co-Counsel Pro Hac Vice for all*

20 *Petitioners except SHAC, LLC*

21 [Additional counsel on following page]

22 DISTRICT COURT
23 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

24 K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino
25 Gentlemen's Club, et al.,

26 Petitioners,
27 vs.

28 NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
TAXATION, and NEVADA TAX
COMMISSION,

Respondents.

Case No.: A-11-648894-J
Consolidated with A-14-697515-J
Dept. 30

Notice of Appeal

Notice of Appeal

1 NEIL BELLER (2360)
2 NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.
3 7408 W. Sahara Ave.
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
5 Tel: (702) 368-7767
6 Fax: (702) 368-7720
7 Email: NBeller@NJBlttd.com
8 *Local Counsel for Petitioners*

9 MARK E. FERRARIO (1625)
10 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
11 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
12 Suite 400 North
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
14 Tel: (702) 792-3773
15 Fax: (702) 792-9002
16 Email: ferrariom@gtlaw.com
17 *Counsel for Petitioner*
18 *SHAC, LLC*

19 Notice of Appeal

20 Notice is hereby given that petitioners hereby appeal to the Supreme
21 Court of Nevada from the order denying judicial review of administrative
22 decision filed on January 15, 2016, notice of entry filed on February 4, 2016.

23 Date: February 26, 2016

24 Respectfully submitted,

25 LAMBROSE | BROWN

26 By: /s/ William H. Brown
27 William H. Brown, Esq. (7623)
28 300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 816-2200
Fax: (702) 816-2300
Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com
Attorney for Petitioner, K-Kel, Inc.

Notice of Appeal

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that I am an employee of LAMBROSE | BROWN and that on this date I served the foregoing **Notice of Appeal** to the parties listed below by causing a full, true, and correct copy to be e-filed and e-served.

E-service

With a courtesy copy to:

Adam Paul Laxalt
Attorney General

District Court Dept. 30
Email:
dept30lc@clarkcountycourts.us

David J. Pope
Senior Deputy Attorney
General
Email: dpope@ag.nv.gov

Debra Turman
Email: dturman@ag.nv.gov

Vivienne Rakowsky
Deputy Attorney General
Email: vrakowsky@ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for *Respondents*

Michele Caro
Email: mcaro@ag.nv.gov

Andrea Rosehill
Email: rosehilla@gtlaw.com

Mark Ferrario
Email: lvlitdock@gtlaw.com


LVGTDocketing
Email: lvlitdock@gtlaw.com

Shayna Noyce
Email: noyces@gtlaw.com

Tami Cowden
Email: cowdent@gtlaw.com

Date: **February 26, 2016**

By: /s/ Deidra Hufnagle
An employee of
LAMBROSE | BROWN



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **ASTA**
2 WILLIAM H. BROWN (7623)
3 LAMBROSE | BROWN PLLC
4 300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
6 Tel: (702) 816-2200
7 Fax: (702) 816-2300
8 Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com
9 *Attorney for Petitioner,*
10 *K-Kel, Inc.*

11 BRADLEY J. SHAFER
12 Michigan Bar No. P36604
13 SHAFER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
14 3800 Capital City Blvd., Suite #2
15 Lansing, Michigan 48906-2110
16 Tel: (517) 886-6560
17 Fax: (517) 886-6565
18 Email: Brad@bradshaferlaw.com
19 *Co-Counsel Pro Hac Vice for all*
20 *Petitioners except SHAC, LLC*

21 [Additional counsel on following page]

22 DISTRICT COURT
23 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

24 K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino
25 Gentlemen's Club, et al.,

26 Petitioners,
27 vs.

28 NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
TAXATION, and NEVADA TAX
COMMISSION,

Respondents.

Case No.: A-11-648894-J
Consolidated with A-14-697515-J

Dept. 30

Case Appeal Statement

1 NEIL BELLER (2360)
2 NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.
3 7408 W. Sahara Ave.
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
5 Tel: (702) 368-7767
6 Fax: (702) 368-7720
7 Email: NBeller@NJBlltd.com
8 *Local Counsel for Petitioners*

9 MARK E. FERRARIO (1625)
10 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
11 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
12 Suite 400 North
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
14 Tel: (702) 792-3773
15 Fax: (702) 792-9002
16 Email: ferrariom@gtlaw.com
17 *Counsel for Petitioner*
18 *SHAC, LLC*

Case Appeal Statement

1. Appellant filing this case appeal statement:

17 K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino Gentlemen's Club, OLYMPUS
18 GARDEN, INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden, SHAC, L.L.C. d/b/a Sapphire,
19 D. WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures, DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS OF
20 LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a/ Déjà vu, and LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS
21 VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Little Darlings.

2. Judge issuing the decision, judgment, or order appealed from:

22 The Honorable Jerry A. Wiese II.

3. Each appellant, and the name and address of counsel for each appellant:

- 26 a. K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino Gentlemen's Club
27 **Counsel:**
28 WILLIAM H. BROWN (7623)
LAMBROSE | BROWN

300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 816-2200
Fax: (702) 816-2300
Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com

Co-counsel:

BRADLEY J. SHAFER
Michigan Bar No. P36604
SHAFFER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
3800 Capital City Blvd., Suite #2
Lansing, Michigan 48906-2110
Tel: (517) 886-6560
Fax: (517) 886-6565
Email: Brad@bradshaferlaw.com

b. SHAC, L.L.C. d/b/a Sapphire

Counsel:

MARK E. FERRARIO (1625)
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
Suite 400 North
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Tel: (702) 792-3773
Fax: (702) 792-9002
Email: ferrariom@gtlaw.com

c. D. WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures, DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS
OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a/ Déjà vu and LITTLE DARLINGS
OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Little Darlings

Counsel:

BRADLEY J. SHAFER
Michigan Bar No. P36604
SHAFFER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
3800 Capital City Blvd., Suite #2
Lansing, Michigan 48906-2110
Tel: (517) 886-6560
Fax: (517) 886-6565
Email: Brad@bradshaferlaw.com

4. Each respondent, and the name and address of counsel for each respondent:

a. NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION, and NEVADA COMMISSION

Counsel:

ADAM PAUL LAXALT

Attorney General

DAVID J. POPE (8617)

Senior Deputy Attorney General

VIVIENNE RAKOWSKY (9160)

Deputy Attorney General

555 E. Washington Ave., Suite 3900

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Tel: (702) 486-3103

Fax: (702) 486-3416

Email: DPope@ag.nv.gov;

VRakowsky@ag.nv.gov

5. Attorney(s) appearing pro hac vice under SCR 42:

a. BRADLEY J. SHAFER

Michigan Bar No. P36604

SHAFER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

3800 Capital City Blvd., Suite #2

Lansing, Michigan 48906-2110

The district court granted Mr. Shafer permission to appear pro hac vice under SCR 42 on April 23, 2008.¹ See order admitting to practice (**Ex. 1**).

¹ This case is actually the continuation of an earlier case, but in a different form. The case began as *Déjà Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas LLC, et al. v. Nev. Dept. Tax, et al.* (A554970). There, the plaintiffs (the petitioners here) challenged facially, and as applied, the constitutionality of Nevada's Live Entertainment Tax (NRS Chapter 368A, the "LET"). After an unsuccessful administrative challenge, they filed a de novo action (as opposed to a petition for judicial review). The district court found that was error under *S. California Edison v. First Judicial Dist. Court of State of Nevada*, 127 Nev. Adv. Op. 22, 255 P.3d 231, 233 (2011), so the court dismissed the de novo action and ordered that it "shall proceed a petition for judicial review"—

1 **6. Whether appellants were represented by retained or appointed**
2 **counsel:**

3 Retained.

4 **7. Whether appellants are represented by retained or appointed**
5 **counsel on appeal:**

6 Retained.

7 **8. Whether leave to proceed in forma pauperis was sought, or**
8 **granted:**

9 No, leave was not sought.

10 **9. Date proceedings commenced in district court:**

11 September 23, 2011.²

12 **10. The nature of the action, the result in district court (including**
13 **type of judgment or order being appealed and relief granted by**
14 **district court):**

15 This matter began as a facial and as applied challenge to the
16 constitutionality of Nevada's Live Entertainment Tax (NRS Chapter 368A,
17 the "LET"). Initially, the petitioners challenged the LET administratively, a
18 process that culminated with a final decision from the Nevada Tax
19 Commission dated October 12, 2007 rejecting the challenge (the "NTC
20 decision").

21
22
23
24
25 which is this case. See order entered 11-1-2011 (**Ex. 2**). The order granting
26 Mr. Shafer pro hac vice admission was entered at the outset of this challenge,
in the de novo action. See order granting pro hac vice permission (**Ex. 1**).

27 ² As discussed (note 1, above), this case began as a lawsuit filed on January 9,
28 2008, but on November 1, 2011, the district court ordered it to "proceed as a
petition for judicial review[]" which was filed on September 23, 2011. See
order entered 11-1-2011 (**Ex. 2**).

1 Following the NTC decision, the petitioners sued (as plaintiffs) in *Déjà*
2 *Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas LLC, et al. v. Nev. Dept. Tax, et al.* (A554970). But
3 the district court dismissed the suit and ordered that it “shall proceed as a
4 petition for judicial review.” See order entered 11-1-2011 (**Ex. 2**). Accordingly,
5 the petitioners appealed the NTC decision via a petition for judicial review
6 under NRS Chapter 233B.

7 On January 15, 2016, the district court entered its order denying
8 judicial review of the NTC decision. The court found there was substantial
9 evidence supporting Nevada Tax Commission’s decisions and they did not
10 violate NRS 233B.135. Consequently, the court affirmed the NTC decision,
11 and denied the petitioner’s petition for judicial review (the “district court’s
12 order”).

13 Now, the petitioners appeal the district court’s order.

14 Date: February 26, 2016

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 LAMBROSE | BROWN

17 By: /s/ William H. Brown

18 William H. Brown, Esq. (7623)

19 300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700

20 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

21 Tel: (702) 816-2200

22 Fax: (702) 816-2300

23 Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com

24 *Attorney for Petitioner,*

25 *K-Kel, Inc.*

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that I am an employee of LAMBROSE | BROWN and that on this date I served the foregoing **Case Appeal Statement** to the parties listed below by causing a full, true, and correct copy to be e-filed and e-served.

E-service

With a courtesy copy to:

Adam Paul Laxalt
Attorney General

District Court Dept. 30
Email: dept30lc@clarkcountycourts.us

David J. Pope
Senior Deputy Attorney
General
Email: dpope@ag.nv.gov

Debra Turman
Email: dturman@ag.nv.gov

Vivienne Rakowsky
Deputy Attorney General
Email: vrakowsky@ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for *Respondents*

Michele Caro
Email: mcaro@ag.nv.gov
Andrea Rosehill
Email: rosehilla@gtlaw.com

Mark Ferrario
Email: lvlitdock@gtlaw.com

LVGTDocketing
Email: lvlitdock@gtlaw.com

Shayna Noyce
Email: novces@gtlaw.com

Tami Cowden
Email: cowdent@gtlaw.com

Date: **February 26, 2016**

By: /s/ Deidra Hufnagle
An employee of
LAMBROSE | BROWN

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 2


CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **ORDR**
2 CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO
3 Attorney General
4 DAVID J. POPE
5 Senior Deputy Attorney General
6 Nevada Bar No. 008617
7 BLAKE A. DOERR
8 Senior Deputy Attorney General
9 Nevada Bar No. 009001
10 VIVIENNE RAKOWSKY
11 Deputy Attorney General
12 Nevada Bar No. 009160
13 555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900
14 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
15 P: (702) 486-3095
16 F: (702) 486-3416
17 dpope@ag.nv.gov
18 bdoerr@ag.nv.gov
19 vrakowsky@ag.nv.gov
20 Attorneys for Nevada Department of Taxation

12 **DISTRICT COURT**

13 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

14 DÉJÀ VU SHOWGIRLS OF LAS VEGAS,
15 L.L.C., d/b/a Déjà vu Showgirls, LITTLE
16 DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, L.L.C., d/b/a Little
17 Darlings, K-KEL, INC. d/b/a Spearmint Rhino
18 Gentlemen's Club, OLYMPUS GARDEN, INC.,
19 d/b/a Olympic Garden, SHAC, L.L.C., d/b/a
20 Sapphire, THE POWER COMPANY, INC., d/b/a
21 Crazy Horse Too Gentlemen's Club, D.)
22 WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures, and D.I.)
23 FOOD & BEVERAGE OF LAS VEGAS, L.L.C.,
24 d/b/a Scores,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 vs.

22 NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION,
23 NEVADA TAX COMMISSION, NEVADA
24 STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS, and
25 MICHELLE JACOBS, in her official capacity
26 only,

25 Defendants.

Case No. 06A533273
Dept. No. XI

Coordinated with:

Case No. 08A554970
Dept. No. XI

ORDER

Attorney General's Office
555 E. Washington, Suite 3900
Las Vegas, NV 89101

1 K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino)
2 Gentlemen's Club; OLYMPUS GARDEN, INC.,
3 d/b/a Olymic Garden; SHAC, LLC, d/b/a
4 Sapphire; THE POWER COMPANY, INC., d/b/a
5 Crazy Horse Too Gentlemen's Club; D.)
6 WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures; and D.I.)
7 FOOD & BEVERAGE OF LAS VEGAS, LLC.)
8 d/b/a Scores;

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION;
12 NEVADA TAX COMMISSION; and NEVADA
13 STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS,

14 Defendants.

Case No. 08A554970
Dept. No. XI

15 ORDER

16 DEFENDANTS' RE-NOTICED MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON
17 THE PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS FOR REFUND AND MOTION TO DISMISS THE AS APPLIED
18 CHALLENGE TO THE LIVE ENTERTAINMENT TAX AND THE CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES
19 PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. §1983 and DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL came on for
20 hearing on August 23, 2011;

21 David J. Pope, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Blake A. Doerr, Senior Deputy
22 Attorney General, and Vivienne Rakowsky, Deputy Attorney General appeared on behalf of
23 the Defendants; William J. Brown, Esq. and Bradley J. Shafer, Esq. appeared on behalf of the
24 Plaintiffs; Mark E. Ferrario appeared on behalf of Plaintiff SHAC, LLC.

25 The Court having first requested that Defendants' motion for partial summary judgment
26 and motion to dismiss be re-noticed and having considered the papers and pleadings
27 regarding the re-noticed motion and the motion to compel, as well as the oral argument
28 presented by all parties, hereby orders:

...

...

...

1 DEFENDANTS' RE-NOTICED MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON
2 THE PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS FOR REFUND AND MOTION TO DISMISS THE AS APPLIED
3 CHALLENGE TO THE LIVE ENTERTAINMENT TAX AND THE CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES
4 PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. §1983 is granted in part and denied in part.

5 With regard to Defendants' motion to dismiss and/or motion for partial summary
6 judgment in Case #08A554970 ("Case 2"), this Court finds that the Defendants timely raised
7 the question regarding the procedural posture of the case and based on the Nevada Supreme
8 Court's decision in *Southern California Edison*, 127 Nev.Adv.Op. 22 (2011) all claims are
9 dismissed and Case 2 shall proceed as a petition for judicial review pursuant to Chapter 233B
10 of the NRS. The Court having tolled the statute of limitations for thirty (30) days to allow
11 Plaintiffs thirty (30) days to file a petition for judicial review, Plaintiffs shall have thirty (30)
12 days from August 23, 2011 to file a petition for judicial review pursuant to NRS 233B.130, et
13 seq.

14 With regard to Defendants' motion to dismiss and/or for partial summary judgment in
15 Case #06A533273 ("Case 1"), the motion is granted and all other claims including the "as
16 applied" challenge, the refund claims and the official capacity claim against Michelle Jacobs
17 are dismissed and Case 1 shall proceed as a facial challenge for declaratory relief only.
18 Briefs are to be filed within thirty (30) days.

19 With regard to Defendants' motion to dismiss and/or for partial summary judgment
20 regarding all 42 U.S.C. §1983 damages claims, the motion is granted and all such damages
21 claims are dismissed from Case 1 and Case 2.

22 With regard to Plaintiffs motion to remand Case 2 to the Nevada Tax Commission, the
23 motion is denied.

24
25
26 ...
27 ...
28 ...

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

With regard to DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL, this Court finds that any further discovery would be inappropriate and is hereby ordered cancelled.


IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 27th day of October, 2011.


DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Respectfully submitted:

CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO
Attorney General

By: 
David J. Pope
Senior Deputy Attorney General

ORIGINAL

16

ORDR

DIANA L. SULLIVAN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar #4701
GHANEM & SULLIVAN, LLP
930 South Fourth Street, Suite 210
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Telephone: (702) 862-4450
Facsimile: (702) 862-4422
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

FILED

Apr 23 11 08 AM '08

Chaf
CLERK OF THE COURT

BRADLEY J. SHAFER*
Michigan Bar # P36604
Shafer & Associates, P.C.
3800 Capital City Blvd., Suite 2
Lansing, Michigan 48906-2110
(517) 886-6560 - telephone
(517) 886-6565 - facsimile
Email: shaferassociates@acd.net
* Pending Admission Pro Hac Vice

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

K-KEL, INC., d/b/a *Spearmint Rhino*
Gentlemen's Club, OLYMPUS GARDEN,
INC., d/b/a *Olympic Garden*, SHAC, LLC, d/b/a
Sapphire, THE POWER COMPANY, INC.,
d/b/a *Crazy Horse Too Gentlemen's Club*, D.
WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a *Treasures*, and D.I.
FOOD & BEVERAGE OF LAS VEGAS, LLC,
d/b/a *Scores*,

Case No.: A554970
Dept. No.: IX

Plaintiffs,

vs.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION,
NEVADA TAX COMMISSION, NEVADA
STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS,

Defendants.

ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE

BRADLEY J. SHAFER, ESQ. having filed his Motion to Associate Counsel under
Nevada Supreme Court Rule 42, together with a Verified Application for Association of

RECEIVED

MAR 14 2008

DEPT IX

CLERK OF IN...

RECEIVED
APR 23 2008

1 Counsel, a Certificate of Good Standing for the states of Michigan and Arizona, and the State
2 Bar of Nevada Statement; said application having been noticed, no objections having being
3 made, and the Court being fully apprised in the premises, and good cause appearing, it is
4 hereby

5 **ORDERED**, that said application is hereby granted, and Bradley J. Shafer, Esq. is
6 hereby admitted to practice in the above-entitled Court for the purposes of the above entitled
7 matter only.
8

9 DATED this 21st day of April 2008.

10
11 
12 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

13 Submitted by:

14 GHANEM & SULLIVAN, LLP


15 
16 DIANA L. SULLIVAN, ESQ.

17 Nevada Bar #4701

18 930 South Fourth Street, Suite 210

19 Las Vegas, NV 89101

20 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 NODE

2 WILLIAM H. BROWN (7623)
3 LAMBROSE | BROWN PLLC
4 300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
6 Tel: (702) 816-2200
7 Fax: (702) 816-2300
8 Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com
9 *Attorney for Petitioner*
10 *K-Kel, Inc.*

11 BRADLEY J. SHAFER
12 Michigan Bar No. P36604
13 SHAFER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
14 3800 Capital City Blvd., Suite #2
15 Lansing, Michigan 48906-2110
16 Tel: (517) 886-6560
17 Fax: (517) 886-6565
18 Email: Brad@bradshaferlaw.com
19 *Co-Counsel Pro Hac Vice for all*
20 *Petitioners except SHAC, LLC*

21 [Additional counsel on following page]

22 DISTRICT COURT
23 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

24 K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino
25 Gentlemen's Club, et al.,

26 Petitioners,
27 vs.

28 NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
TAXATION, and NEVADA TAX
COMMISSION,

Respondents.

Case No.: A-11-648894-J
Consolidated with A-14-697515-J
Dept. 30

**Notice of Depositing Security for
Costs on Appeal**

1 NEIL BELLER (2360)
2 NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.
3 7408 W. Sahara Ave.
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
5 Tel: (702) 368-7767
6 Fax: (702) 368-7720
7 Email: NBeller@NJBlltd.com
8 *Local Counsel for Petitioners*

9 MARK E. FERRARIO (1625)
10 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
11 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
12 Suite 400 North
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
14 Tel: (702) 792-3773
15 Fax: (702) 792-9002
16 Email: ferrariom@gtlaw.com
17 *Counsel for Petitioner*
18 *SHAC, LLC*

19 Notice of Depositing Security for Costs on Appeal

20 Notice is hereby given that in accordance with NRAP 7, Petitioner, K-
21 Kel Inc. has deposited \$500.00, payable to the Clark County Court Clerk, as
22 security for the payment of costs on appeal.

23 Date: February 29, 2016

24 Respectfully submitted,

25 LAMBROSE | BROWN

26 By: /s/ William H. Brown
27 WILLIAM H. BROWN (7623)
28 LAMBROSE | BROWN
300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com
Attorney for Petitioner, K-Kel, Inc.

Notice of Depositing Security for Costs on Appeal

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that I am an employee of LAMBROSE | BROWN and that on this date I served the foregoing **Notice of Depositing Security for Costs on Appeal** to the parties listed below by causing a full, true, and correct copy to e-filed and e-served.

E-service

With a courtesy copy to:

Adam Paul Laxalt
Attorney General

District Court Dept. 30
Email: dept30lc@clarkcountycourts.us

David J. Pope
Senior Deputy Attorney
General
Email: dpope@ag.nv.gov

Debra Turman
Email: dturman@ag.nv.gov

Vivienne Rakowsky
Deputy Attorney General
Email: vrakowsky@ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for *Respondents*

Michele Caro
Email: mcaro@ag.nv.gov

Andrea Rosehill
Email: rosehilla@gtlaw.com

Mark Ferrario
Email: lvlitdock@gtlaw.com


LVGTDocketing
Email: lvlitdock@gtlaw.com

Shayna Noyce
Email: noyces@gtlaw.com

Tami Cowden
Email: cowdent@gtlaw.com

Date: **February 29, 2016**

By: /s/ Deidra Hufnagle
An employee of
LAMBROSE | BROWN



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **REQT**

2 WILLIAM H. BROWN (7623)
3 LAMBROSE | BROWN PLLC
4 300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
6 Tel: (702) 816-2200
7 Fax: (702) 816-2300
8 Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com
9 *Attorney for Petitioner*
10 *K-Kel, Inc.*

11 BRADLEY J. SHAFER
12 Michigan Bar No. P36604
13 SHAFER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
14 3800 Capital City Blvd., Suite #2
15 Lansing, Michigan 48906-2110
16 Tel: (517) 886-6560
17 Fax: (517) 886-6565
18 Email: Brad@bradshaferlaw.com
19 *Co-Counsel Pro Hac Vice for all*
20 *Petitioners except SHAC, LLC*

21 [Additional counsel on following page]

22 **DISTRICT COURT**
23 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

24 K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino
25 Gentlemen's Club, et al.,

26 Petitioners,
27 vs.

28 NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
TAXATION, and NEVADA TAX
COMMISSION,

Respondents.

Case No.: A-11-648894-J
Consolidated with A-14-697515-J
Dept. 30

**Request for Transcript of
Proceedings on Appeal**

1 NEIL BELLER (2360)
2 NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.
3 7408 W. Sahara Ave.
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
5 Tel: (702) 368-7767
6 Fax: (702) 368-7720
7 Email: NBeller@NJBlltd.com
8 *Local Counsel for Petitioners*

9 MARK E. FERRARIO (1625)
10 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
11 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
12 Suite 400 North
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
14 Tel: (702) 792-3773
15 Fax: (702) 792-9002
16 Email: ferrariom@gtlaw.com
17 *Counsel for Petitioner*
18 *SHAC, LLC*

Request for Transcript of Proceedings on Appeal

To: Kristy Clark, Court Reporter/Recorder District Court, Dept. 30

Petitioners K-Kel, Inc., et al., hereby request preparation of a
transcript on appeal of certain portions of the proceedings before the District
Court Judge, Jerry A. Wiese, II as follows:

Date of Proceedings:

1. October 27, 2015 (hearing on petition for judicial review).

Portions of the transcript requested:

The full hearing transcript for the above listed date.

Number of transcripts requested:

That the above-named court reporter shall have thirty (30) days from the date of service of this document to prepare an original plus two copies and file with the Supreme Court Clerk the original transcript requested herein.

Further, pursuant to NRAP 9, **the court reporter shall also deliver copies of the transcript to appellant's counsel and respondent's counsel** no more than thirty (30) days after the date of the appellant's request.

[Blank]

1 I hereby certify that on this date I ordered these transcripts from the
2 court reporter named above, and paid the required deposit.
3

4 Date: February 29, 2016

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 LAMBROSE | BROWN
7

8 By: /s/ William H. Brown
9 WILLIAM H. BROWN (7623)
10 LAMBROSE | BROWN
11 300 S. Fourth St., Ste. 700
12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
13 Tel: (702) 816-2200
14 Fax: (702) 816-2300
15 Email: WBrown@LambroseBrown.com
16 *Attorney for Petitioner*
17 *K-Kel, Inc.*
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that I am an employee of LAMBROSE | BROWN and that on this date I served the foregoing **Request for Transcript of Proceedings on Appeal** to the parties listed below by causing a full, true, and correct copy to e-filed and e-served.

E-service

With a courtesy copy to:

Adam Paul Laxalt
Attorney General

District Court Dept. 30
Email: dept30lc@clarkcountycourts.us

David J. Pope
Senior Deputy Attorney
General
Email: dpope@ag.nv.gov

Debra Turman
Email: dturman@ag.nv.gov

Vivienne Rakowsky
Deputy Attorney General
Email: vrakowsky@ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for *Respondents*

Michele Caro
Email: mcaro@ag.nv.gov

Andrea Rosehill
Email: rosehilla@gtlaw.com

Service by fax:
Kristy Clark, Court
Reporter/Recorder District
Court, Dept. 30
Fax: (702) 366-1409

Mark Ferrario
Email: lvlitdock@gtlaw.com

LVGTDocketing
Email: lvlitdock@gtlaw.com

Shayna Noyce
Email: noyces@gtlaw.com

Tami Cowden
Email: cowdent@gtlaw.com

Date: **February 29, 2016**

By: /s/ Deidra Hufnagle
An employee of
LAMBROSE | BROWN

DEPARTMENT 30
CASE SUMMARY
CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

§
§
§
§
§

Location: **Department 30**
Judicial Officer: **Wiese, Jerry A.**
Filed on: **09/23/2011**
Cross-Reference Case Number: **A648894**

CASE INFORMATION

Related Cases

A-14-697515-J (Consolidated)

Case Type: **Civil Petition for Judicial Review**

Statistical Closures

12/02/2015 Summary Judgment

Case Flags: **Consolidated - Lead Case
Appealed to Supreme Court**

DATE

CASE ASSIGNMENT

Current Case Assignment

Case Number	A-11-648894-J
Court	Department 30
Date Assigned	09/23/2011
Judicial Officer	Wiese, Jerry A.

PARTY INFORMATION

Plaintiff

D I Food and Beverage of Las Vegas LLC

Lead Attorneys

Brown, William H.
Retained
702-816-2200(W)

D Westwood Inc

Brown, William H.
Retained
702-816-2200(W)

Deja Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas

Brown, William H.
Retained
702-816-2200(W)

K-Kel, Inc.

Brown, William H.
Retained
702-816-2200(W)

Little Darlings of Las Vegas LLC

Brown, William H.
Retained
702-816-2200(W)

Olympus Garden Inc

Brown, William H.
Retained
702-816-2200(W)

Power Company Inc

Brown, William H.
Retained
702-816-2200(W)

Shac LLC

Brown, William H.
Retained
702-816-2200(W)

Defendant

Nevada Department of Taxation










Pope, David J.
Retained
7026568084(W)

Nevada Tax Commission

Pope, David J.
Retained



DEPARTMENT 30
CASE SUMMARY
CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

7026568084(W)

DATE	EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT	INDEX
09/23/2011	 Petition for Judicial Review Filed by: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Petition for Judicial Review</i>	
09/23/2011	Case Opened	
09/28/2011	 Application Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission</i>	
10/07/2011	 Statement Filed by: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Statement of Intent to Participate</i>	
10/12/2011	 Notice of Hearing Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Notice of Hearing for Plaintiff's Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission</i>	
10/21/2011	 Administrative Record Party: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Administrative Record</i>	
10/21/2011	 Opposition Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Opposition to Petitioners Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission</i>	
10/25/2011	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time</i>	
10/26/2011	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Notice of Entry of Order</i>	
11/07/2011	 Reply in Support Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Reply in Support of Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission</i>	
11/09/2011	 Motion to Dismiss Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Nevada Department of Taxation's and Nevada Tax Commission's Motion to Dismiss Petitioner's Deja Vu and Little Darlings</i>	
11/10/2011	 Certificate of Service Filed by: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Certificate of Service</i>	
11/21/2011	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation	















DEPARTMENT 30
CASE SUMMARY
CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

Notice of Entry of Order












11/21/2011	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Stipulation and Order for Continuance</i>
12/09/2011	 Motion for Leave (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.) Events: 09/28/2011 Application <i>Plaintiff's K-Kel, Olympus Garden Inc, The Power Company Inc, Westwood Inc, D.I. Food & Beverage of Las Vegas LLC, Deja Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas LLC and Little Darlings of Las Vegas LLC's Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission</i>
12/16/2011	 Motion to Dismiss (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.) <i>Nevada Department of Taxation's and Nevada Tax Commission's Motion to Dismiss Petitioner's Deja Vu and Little Darlings</i>
01/26/2012	 Objection Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Petitioners' Objections to Proposed Order Submitted by Respondents Nevada Department of Taxation and Nevada Tax Commission</i>
02/01/2012	 Order Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Order Granting Plaintiffs Application for Leave to Present Additional Evidence to the Nevada Tax Commission</i>
02/02/2012	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Notice of Entry of Order</i>
02/02/2012	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Notice of Entry of Order</i>
05/02/2012	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Opposition to Motion for Stay on OST</i>
05/07/2012	 Motion to Stay Filed By: Plaintiff D I Food and Beverage of Las Vegas LLC <i>Motion to Stay Administrative Hearing Pending Superseding Appeals Currently Before Nevada Supreme Court on OST</i>
05/23/2012	 Supplement to Opposition Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Supplement to Opposition to Motion for Stay</i>
06/01/2012	 Reply to Opposition Filed by: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Reply Supporting Motion to Stay Administrative Hearing Pending Superseding Appeals Currently Before Nevada Supreme Court on OST</i>
06/08/2012	 Motion For Stay (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.) <i>Petitioners' Motion to Stay Administrative Hearing Pending Superseding Appeals Currently</i>

DEPARTMENT 30
CASE SUMMARY
CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

Before Nevada Supreme Court on OST

06/21/2012	 Order Denying Motion Filed By: Defendant Nevada Tax Commission <i>Order Denying Stay</i>
06/22/2012	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Notice of Entry of Order</i>
10/30/2012	 Reporters Transcript Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Reporter's Transcript Of Proceedings June 8, 2012</i>
10/30/2012	 Reporters Transcript Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Reporter's Transcript Of Proceedings December 8, 2012</i>
09/09/2013	 Order Scheduling Status Check <i>Order Scheduling Status Check</i>
10/15/2013	 Status Check (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.) 10/15/2013, 03/25/2014, 09/23/2014, 10/21/2014
03/19/2014	 Notice of Change of Address Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Notice of Change of Address</i>
03/24/2014	 Motion Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Stipulation and Order Consolidating Cases</i>
03/24/2014	 Notice of Department Reassignment
03/26/2014	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Notice of Entry of Order</i>
03/28/2014	 Notice of Entry of Order <i>Notice of Entry of Order</i>
01/21/2015	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time</i>
01/22/2015	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time</i>
01/26/2015	 Supplement Filed by: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Supplement to the Record on Appeal in Accordance with the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act</i>

DEPARTMENT 30
CASE SUMMARY
CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

01/26/2015	 Transmittal of Record on Appeal Party: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Transmittal of Supplement to the Record on Appeal</i>
02/10/2015	 Memorandum of Points and Authorities Filed By: Plaintiff Shac LLC <i>Petitioners' Memorandum of Points and Authorities In Support of Petition for Judicial Review</i>
03/30/2015	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time</i>
03/31/2015	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Notice of Entry of Order Granting Stipulation and Order to Extend Time</i>
04/30/2015	 Answering Brief Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Answering Brief in Opposition to Petition for Judicial Review</i>
06/04/2015	CANCELED Hearing (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.) <i>Vacated - per Stipulation and Order</i>
06/04/2015	 Reply in Support Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Petitioners' Reply In Support of Petition for Judicial Review</i>
06/05/2015	 Errata Filed By: Plaintiff Shac LLC <i>Errata Re Petitioners' Reply In Support of Petition for Judicial Review</i>
06/10/2015	 Request Filed by: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Petitioners' Request for Hearing</i>
07/07/2015	 Motion for Leave to File Party: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief Regarding New U.S. Supreme Court Precedent</i>
07/15/2015	 Supplement Filed by: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. <i>Supplement to Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief Regarding New U.S. Supreme Court Precedent</i>
07/17/2015	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Nevada Department of Taxation's Opposition to Petitioners' Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief</i>
07/24/2015	CANCELED Decision (3:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.) <i>Vacated</i>
07/30/2015	CANCELED Motion (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.) <i>Vacated</i>

DEPARTMENT 30
CASE SUMMARY
CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

Petitioners' Request for Hearing

08/06/2015



Errata

Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc.

Errata to Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief Regarding New U.S. Supreme Court Precedent

09/09/2015



Reply in Support

Filed By: Plaintiff Shac LLC

Reply In Support of Petitioners' Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief


09/22/2015



Motion for Leave (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.)

Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief Regarding New U.S. Supreme Court Precedent

10/05/2015



Opposition

Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation

Nevada Department of Taxation's Opposition to Petitioners' Supplemental Brief

10/09/2015



Order Granting Motion

Filed By: Plaintiff Shac LLC

Order Granting Petitioners' Motion to File Supplemental Brief and Setting Hearing on Petition for Judicial Review

10/13/2015



Notice of Entry of Order

Filed By: Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc.

Notice of Entry of Order Granting Petitioners' Motion to File Supplemental Brief and Setting Hearing on Petition for Judicial Review

10/13/2015



Reply to Opposition

Filed by: Plaintiff Shac LLC

Petitioners' Reply to Nevada Department of Taxation's Opposition to Petitioners' Supplemental Brief

10/27/2015



Supplemental Brief

Filed By: Plaintiff Shac LLC

Supplemental Memorandum of Points and Authorities

10/27/2015



Hearing (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.)

PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

11/24/2015



Minute Order (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.)

PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

12/02/2015



Order to Statistically Close Case

Civil Order to Statistically Close Case

01/15/2016



Order Denying Judicial Review of Administrative Decision

Filed by: Defendant Nevada Tax Commission

Order Denying Judicial Review of Administrative Decision

01/15/2016






Order Denying Judicial Review (Judicial Officer: Wiese, Jerry A.)

Debtors: K-Kel, Inc. (Plaintiff), Olympus Garden Inc (Plaintiff), Deja Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas (Plaintiff), Little Darlings of Las Vegas LLC (Plaintiff), Shac LLC (Plaintiff)

Creditors: Nevada Department of Taxation (Defendant), Nevada Tax Commission (Defendant)

Judgment: 01/15/2016, Docketed: 01/22/2016

DEPARTMENT 30
CASE SUMMARY
CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

02/04/2016	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant Nevada Department of Taxation <i>Notice of Entry of Order Denying Judicial Review of Administrative Decision</i>
02/26/2016	 Notice of Appeal Filed By: Consolidated Case Party SHAC LLC <i>Notice of Appeal</i>
02/26/2016	 Case Appeal Statement Filed By: Consolidated Case Party SHAC LLC <i>Case Appeal Statement</i>
02/29/2016	 Notice of Deposit Filed By: Consolidated Case Party SHAC LLC <i>Notice of Depositing Security for Costs on Appeal</i>
02/29/2016	 Request Filed by: Plaintiff Shac LLC <i>Request for Transcript of Proceedings on Appeal</i>

DATE	FINANCIAL INFORMATION
	Consolidated Case Party SHAC LLC Total Charges 24.00 Total Payments and Credits 24.00 Balance Due as of 3/1/2016 0.00
	Plaintiff D I Food and Beverage of Las Vegas LLC Total Charges 30.00 Total Payments and Credits 30.00 Balance Due as of 3/1/2016 0.00
	Plaintiff D Westwood Inc Total Charges 30.00 Total Payments and Credits 30.00 Balance Due as of 3/1/2016 0.00
	Plaintiff Deja Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas Total Charges 30.00 Total Payments and Credits 30.00 Balance Due as of 3/1/2016 0.00
	Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc. Total Charges 270.00 Total Payments and Credits 270.00 Balance Due as of 3/1/2016 0.00
	Plaintiff Little Darlings of Las Vegas LLC Total Charges 30.00 Total Payments and Credits 30.00 Balance Due as of 3/1/2016 0.00
	Plaintiff Olympus Garden Inc Total Charges 30.00 Total Payments and Credits 30.00 Balance Due as of 3/1/2016 0.00
	Plaintiff Power Company Inc Total Charges 30.00

DEPARTMENT 30
CASE SUMMARY
CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

Total Payments and Credits	30.00
Balance Due as of 3/1/2016	0.00
Plaintiff Shac LLC	
Total Charges	30.00
Total Payments and Credits	30.00
Balance Due as of 3/1/2016	0.00
Plaintiff K-Kel, Inc.	
Appeal Bond Balance as of 3/1/2016	500.00

CLERK OF THE COURT

ODJR
ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General
DAVID J. POPE
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Bar No. 008617
VIVIENNE RAKOWSKY
Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Bar No. 009160
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
P: (702) 486-3103
F: (702) 486-3416
VRakowsky@ag.nv.gov
DJPope @ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for Respondents

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino
Gentlemen's Club; OLYMPUS GARDEN,
INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden; SHAC, L.L.C.,
d/b/a Sapphire; D. WESTWOOD, INC.,
d/b/a Treasures; DÉJÀ VU SHOWGIRLS
OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Déjà vu; and
LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC,
d/b/a Little Darlings,

Petitioners,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, ex rel.
DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION and TAX
COMMISSION,

Respondents.

Case No.: A-11-648894-J
Dept. No.: XXX

Consolidated with:
Case No.: A-14-697515-J

<input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary Dismissal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Involuntary Dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/> Stipulated Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Disputed Dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/> Default Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Judgment or Verdict by Deft(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Judgment of Arbitration

ORDER DENYING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

The above-referenced matter came before the Honorable Judge Jerry Wiese with regard to the Consolidated Petitions for Judicial Review of the decisions by the Nevada Tax Commission (hereinafter "Commission") filed by Petitioners, K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino Gentlemen s Club, OLYMPUS GARDEN, INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden, SHAC, LLC

1 d/b/a Sapphire, D. WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures, DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS OF LAS
2 VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Deja vu and LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Little
3 Darlings ("Petitioners"). Both sides filed briefs, and the Court heard oral argument. The
4 Petitioners were represented by William Brown Esq., Mark Ferrario, Esq. and Bradley Shafer,
5 Esq. (admitted Pro Hac Vice). The Nevada Tax Commission was represented by Vivienne
6 Rakowsky, Deputy Attorney General and David Pope, Senior Deputy Attorney General.

7 After supplemental briefing regarding the Supreme Court decision in Reed v Town of
8 Gilbert, Arizona, 135 U.S. 2218 (2015), and after oral argument, the Court took the matter
9 under advisement and issued a Minute Order on November 24, 2015 which is attached hereto
10 as Exhibit "A".

11 The procedural history of this matter dates back to a decision by the Nevada Tax
12 Commission dated October 12, 2007 upholding the Live Entertainment Tax
13 (PJR-11-648894-J), a remand in January 2012 to allow the Commission to review additional
14 evidence and determine whether it would amend, affirm or reverse its 2007 decision and re-
15 open discovery to allow depositions (PJR 14-697515-J), and supplemental briefing to
16 determine whether the standard of review for the Live Entertainment Tax changed based on
17 the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015).

18 Based upon the pleadings and papers on file, after hearing oral argument, and good
19 cause appearing, the Court renders the following findings of fact:

- 20 1. The parties essentially agreed to the procedural history and underlying factual
21 background of this case.
- 22 2. The three issues before this Court were:
 - 23 a. Petition for Judicial Review of the Nevada Tax Commission October 12, 2007
24 decision denying Petitioners requests for refunds of Live Entertainment Tax
25 ("NLET") paid, and finding that the NLET does not violate the U.S.
26 Constitution or Nevada Constitution, is not targeted at gentlemen's clubs,
27 and is not a tax based on the content of the taxpayer's message.

- b. Petition for Judicial Review of the Nevada Tax Commission's decision dated September 6, 2012 finding that discovery would not be reopened to allow depositions, and decision on February 12, 2014 upholding the Hearing Officers Hearing on Remand finding that the more than 1,500 pages of supplemental materials were insufficient to cause the Commission's October 12, 2007 decision to be reversed or amended.
 - c. Petitioner's supplemental briefing claiming that the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Reed v. Gilbert Arizona changed the standard of review for determining the constitutionality of the Live Entertainment Tax to strict scrutiny.
 3. The Petitioners made the following arguments:
 - a. That the NLET is unconstitutional because it is a direct tax on First Amendment activities and is statutorily gerrymandered to apply only to a narrowly defined group of speakers, and in doing so discriminates based on the content of the entertainment;
 - b. The Commission should have permitted Petitioners to conduct the requested depositions in order to shed further light on the drafting and amending of the NLET and to identify the purpose for each and every one of the exceptions to the definition of live entertainment set forth in NRS 368A; and
 - c. Based on the recent ruling in Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, U.S. , 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015), strict scrutiny applies, and the NLET does not pass the constitutional muster because there is a differentiation of the application of a law based upon the content of the expression.
 4. The Department made the following arguments:
 - a. That the NLET is Constitutional revenue raising tax and not a tax on a First Amendment right, and the tax has not been applied to the Petitioners in an unconstitutional manner. The Nevada Supreme Court found that the NLET is

1 constitutional on its face in Deja Vu Showgirls v. Department of Taxation, 334
2 P.3d 392 (2014). In that case, the Nevada Supreme Court established that
3 the standard of review for the NLET is a rational basis analysis, because it
4 does not regulate live entertainment, it does not discriminate on the basis of
5 the taxpayers' speech, and it does not target a small group of speakers or
6 threaten to suppress viewpoints. Deja vu, 334 P.3d at 401;

- 7 b. That the Commission's decision on remand to deny depositions should be
8 upheld because, while NRS 233B.131(2) provides for additional evidence
9 under very specific conditions, it does not provide for additional evidence
10 after receiving an adverse decision. Moreover, the information that the
11 Petitioners were seeking was available in 2007. On January 24, 2012, the
12 Court remanded the case to the Commission for review of evidence, not to
13 allow additional evidence to be gathered; and
- 14 c. The standard used by the court to review a tax matter has been in place
15 more than 125 years and has not changed on the basis of a sign ordinance
16 case (Reed). The Court in Deja Vu had previously ruled that heightened
17 scrutiny does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile
18 and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes.

19 The Court made the following conclusions of law:

- 20 5. NRS 233B.135 indicates that the Court shall not substitute its judgment for that of
21 the agency as to the weight of evidence on a question of fact. NRS 233B.135(3).
- 22 6. Pursuant to NRS 233B.135(3), the Court can remand, affirm, or set aside the
23 Commission's decision if the substantial rights of the petitioner have been
24 prejudiced because the agency's decision is in violation of statutory provisions, in
25 excess of the statutory authority of the agency, made upon unlawful procedure,
26 affected by other error of law, clearly erroneous, or an arbitrary or capricious abuse
27 of discretion.
- 28

7. The Commission did not find Petitioner's argument with respect to reopening discovery to allow depositions meritorious because all the information that Petitioners sought recently was available prior to 2007, and the information sought was consistently determined to be irrelevant. The Commission's decision did not violate the constitution or a statute, was not in excess of its statutory authority, was not made upon unlawful procedure, was not affected by other error of law, was not clearly erroneous, and was not arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion. These findings of fact by the Commission may not be disturbed by this Court. The Commission's determination with regard to the request to take depositions is hereby AFFIRMED.
8. The construction of a statute is a question of law, and therefore, independent review is appropriate. However, the court will not readily disturb an administrative interpretation of statutory language. City of Reno v. Reno Police Protective Ass'n., 118 Nev. 889, 900 (2002). The Commission's determination that the NLET is constitutional as applied to the Petitioners is supported by the fact that the Nevada Supreme Court has determined that the NLET does not regulate live entertainment and is simply a tax on a business transaction, and not a tax on the expressive activity taking place within the facility.
9. Petitioners have failed to meet their burden to show that the NLET has attacked the content of their message.
10. The Commission did not exceed their authority by concluding that NLET, as applied to Petitioners, is not an impermissible differential tax, and does not place a burden on a narrowly defined group of speakers.
11. Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, 135 U.S. 2218 (2015), does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes. This Court does not find any evidence here that NLET triggers the application of Reed.

12. The Commission's decision that NLET is not a content-based tax on first amendment activity, but a legitimate tax scheme, evenly applied, and used to raise state revenue shall not be disturbed.

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing, this Court Orders that there was substantial evidence supporting the Commission's decisions and that the Commission's decisions did not violate NRS 233B.135, and consequently, the Commission's decisions are hereby AFFIRMED. The Petition for Judicial Review is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED this 13 day of January, 2016.


DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Respectfully Submitted By:


VIVENNE RAKOWSKY
Deputy Attorney General

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

የገንዘብ አጠቃቀም

Case Type: Civil Petition for Juvenile
Date Filed: 09/23/2011
Location: Department 30
Reference Case Number: A648894

A-14-697515-J (Consolidated)

Defendant	Nevada Department of Taxation	Lead Attorneys David J. Pope <i>À À Retained</i> 7026568084(W)
Defendant	Nevada Tax Commission	David J. Pope <i>À À Retained</i> 7026568084(W)
Plaintiff	D I Food and Beverage of Las Vegas LLC	William H. Brown <i>À À Retained</i> 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	D Westwood Inc	William H. Brown <i>À À Retained</i> 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Deja Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas	William H. Brown <i>À À Retained</i> 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	K-Kel, Inc.	William H. Brown <i>À À Retained</i> 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Little Darlings of Las Vegas LLC	William H. Brown <i>À À Retained</i> 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Olympus Garden Inc	William H. Brown <i>À À Retained</i> 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Power Company Inc	William H. Brown <i>À À Retained</i> 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Shac LLC	William H. Brown <i>À À Retained</i> 702-816-2200(W)

11/24/2015 Minute Order (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer Wiese, Jerry A.)


Minutes

11/24/2015 9:00 AM

- The above-referenced matter came before Judge Jerry Wiese with regard to a Petition for Judicial Review filed by Petitioners, K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino Gentlemen's Club, OLYMPUS GARDEN, INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden, SHAC, LLC d/b/a Sapphire, D. WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures, D J VU SHOWGIRLS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a D j vu and LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Little Darlings. Briefs were filed in this matter, and the Court also heard oral argument. After supplemental briefing regarding the Reed case, and after oral argument, the Court took the matter under advisement. Based upon the pleadings and papers on file, after hearing oral argument, and good cause appearing, the Court now renders the following decision: This Court will not reiterate the procedural history or the factual background of this case, as the parties essentially agree to the underlying facts. Petitioners argue that the Commission should have permitted Petitioners to conduct the requested depositions in order to shed further light on the drafting and amending of the NLET and to identify the purpose for each and every one of the exceptions to the definition of live entertainment set forth in NRS 368A. Petitioners also argue that NLET is unconstitutional because it is a direct tax on First Amendment activities and is statutorily gerrymandered to apply only to a narrowly defined group of speakers, and in doing so discriminates based on the content of the entertainment. Lastly, Petitioners argue that in light of the recent ruling in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona*, ___ U.S. ___, 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015), the NLET does not pass the constitutional muster of strict scrutiny that now applies, whereas in this case, there is a differentiation of the application of a law based upon the content of expression. The Department of Taxation (Department) argues that the Commission's decision on remand to deny depositions should be upheld because, while NRS 233B.131(2) provides for additional evidence under very specific conditions, it does not provide for additional evidence after receiving an adverse decision. This Court remanded the case to the Commission for review of evidence, not to allow additional evidence to be gathered. The Department also argues that NLET is a Constitutional revenue raising tax and not a tax on a First Amendment right, and it has not been applied to the Petitioners in an unconstitutional manner. Furthermore, the Department notes that the Nevada Supreme Court found that the NLET is constitutional on its face in *D j Vu Showgirls v. Department of Taxation*, 334 P.3d 392 (2014). In that case, the Nevada Supreme Court established that the standard of review for the NLET is a rational basis analysis, because it does not regulate live entertainment, it does not discriminate on the basis of the taxpayers' speech, and it does not target a small group of speakers or threaten to suppress viewpoints. *D j vu*, 334 P.3d at 401. Finally, the Department argues that the standard of review for a tax matter has been in place more than 125 years and has not changed on the basis of a sign ordinance case (*Reed*). The Department argues that the Court in *D j Vu* ruled that heightened scrutiny does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes. NRS 233B.135 indicates that the Court shall not substitute its judgment for that of the agency as to the weight of evidence on a question of fact. (NRS 233B.135[3]). Pursuant to NRS 33B.135(3), the Court can remand, affirm, or set aside the Commission's decision if the substantial rights of the petitioner have been prejudiced because the agency's decision is in violation of statutory provisions, in excess of the statutory authority of the agency, made upon unlawful procedure, affected by other error of law, clearly erroneous, or an arbitrary or capricious abuse of discretion. The Commission did not find Petitioner's argument with respect to reopening discovery to allow depositions meritorious because all the information that Petitioners sought recently was available prior to 2007, and the information sought was consistently determined to be irrelevant. These are findings of fact by the Commission that may not be disturbed by this Court. The Court does not find that the Commission's determination violated the constitution or a statute, was in excess of its statutory authority, was made upon unlawful procedure, was affected by other error of law, was clearly erroneous, or was arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion. Consequently, the Commission's determination with regard to the request to take depositions, is hereby AFFIRMED. The construction of a statute is a question of law, and therefore, independent review is appropriate. However, this court will not readily disturb an administrative interpretation of statutory language. *City of Reno v. Reno Police Protective Ass'n*, 118 Nev. 889, 900 (2002). The Commission's determination that the NLET is constitutional as applied to the Petitioners is supported by the fact that the Nevada Supreme Court has determined that the NLET does not regulate live entertainment and is simply a tax on a business transaction, and not on the expressive activity taking place within the facility. Petitioners have failed to meet their burden to show that the NLET has attacked the content of their message. In addition, this Court finds that the Commission did not exceed their authority by concluding that NLET, as applied to Petitioners, is not an impermissible differential tax, and does not place a burden on a narrowly defined group of speakers. This court agrees that *Reed* does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes, which there is no

evidence of here. Therefore, the Commission's decision that NLET is not a content-based tax on first amendment activity, but a legitimate tax scheme, evenly applied, and used to raise state revenue shall not be disturbed. Based upon the foregoing, this Court concludes that there was substantial evidence supporting the Commission's decisions that the Commission's decisions did not violate NRS 233B.135, and consequently, the Commission's decisions are hereby AFFIRMED. The Petition for Judicial Review is DENIED. Respondent's counsel is to prepare an Order consistent with this Minute Order within 10 days, have it approved as to form and content by Petitioner's counsel, and submit to this Court for signature.

[Return to Register of Actions](#)



CLERK OF THE COURT

NEOJ
ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General
DAVID J. POPE
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Bar No. 008617
VIVIENNE RAKOWSKY
Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Bar No. 009160
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
P: (702) 486-3103
F: (702) 486-3416
VRakowsky@ag.nv.gov
DJPope @ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for Respondents

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino
Gentlemen's Club; OLYMPUS GARDEN,
INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden; SHAC, L.L.C.,
d/b/a Sapphire; D. WESTWOOD, INC.,
d/b/a Treasures; DÉJÀ VU SHOWGIRLS
OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Déjà vu; and
LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC,
d/b/a Little Darlings,

Petitioners,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, ex rel.
DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION and TAX
COMMISSION,

Respondents.

Case No.: A-11-648894-J
Dept. No.: XXX

Consolidated with:
Case No.: A-14-697585-J

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING
JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE
DECISION**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the ORDER DENYING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF
ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION was entered on January 13, 2016, and electronically filed on

...

...

...

...

1 January 15th, 2016, a copy of which is attached hereto.

2 DATED this 4th day of February, 2016.

3 Respectfully submitted:

4 ADAM PAUL LAXALT
5 Attorney General

6 By: /S/ VIVIENNE RAKOWSKY
7 DAVID J. POPE
8 Senior Deputy Attorney General
9 VIVIENNE RAKOWSKY
10 Deputy Attorney General
11 Attorneys for Respondents
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Attorney General's Office
555 E. Washington, Suite 3900
Las Vegas, NV 89101

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I certify that I am an employee of the State of Nevada, Office of the Attorney General, and that on the 4th day of February, 2016, I filed and served the foregoing **ORDER DENYING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION** with the Clerk of the Court by using the electronic filing system and placing a true and accurate copy of the foregoing in U.S. Mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, first class, postage prepaid, and via e-mail, to the following:

William H. Brown
Lambrose | Brown
300 S. Fourth Street, Ste. 700
Las Vegas, NV 89101
wbrown@lambrosebrown.com

Bradley J. Shafer
Shafer & Associates, P.C.
3800 Capital City Blvd., Ste. 2
Lansing, MI 48906-2110
brad@bradshaferlaw.com

Mark E. Ferrario, Esq.
Greenberg Traurig, LLP
3773 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Ste. 400 N.
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Attorneys for Shac LLC, dba Sapphire (only)
ferrariom@gtlaw.com

/S/ MICHELE CARO
An employee of the Office of the Attorney General



CLERK OF THE COURT

ODJR
ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General
DAVID J. POPE
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Bar No. 008617
VIVIENNE RAKOWSKY
Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Bar No. 009160
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
P: (702) 486-3103
F: (702) 486-3416
VRakowsky@ag.nv.gov
DJPope @ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for Respondents

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino
Gentlemen's Club; OLYMPUS GARDEN,
INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden; SHAC, L.L.C.,
d/b/a Sapphire; D. WESTWOOD, INC.,
d/b/a Treasures; DÉJÀ VU SHOWGIRLS
OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Déjà vu; and
LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC,
d/b/a Little Darlings,

Petitioners,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, ex rel.
DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION and TAX
COMMISSION,

Respondents.

Case No.: A-11-648894-J
Dept. No.: XXX

Consolidated with:
Case No.: A-14-697515-J

<input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary Dismissal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention by Unopposed	<input type="checkbox"/> Stipulated Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Unopposed Reinstatement	<input type="checkbox"/> Default Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Order of Summary by Debt(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Judgment of Arbitration

ORDER DENYING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

The above-referenced matter came before the Honorable Judge Jerry Wiese with regard to the Consolidated Petitions for Judicial Review of the decisions by the Nevada Tax Commission (hereinafter "Commission") filed by Petitioners, K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino Gentlemen s Club, OLYMPUS GARDEN, INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden, SHAC, LLC

1 d/b/a Sapphire, D. WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures, DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS OF LAS
2 VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Deja vu and LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Little
3 Darlings ("Petitioners"). Both sides filed briefs, and the Court heard oral argument. The
4 Petitioners were represented by William Brown Esq., Mark Ferrario, Esq. and Bradley Shafer,
5 Esq. (admitted Pro Hac Vice). The Nevada Tax Commission was represented by Vivienne
6 Rakowsky, Deputy Attorney General and David Pope, Senior Deputy Attorney General.

7 After supplemental briefing regarding the Supreme Court decision in Reed v Town of
8 Gilbert, Arizona, 135 U.S. 2218 (2015), and after oral argument, the Court took the matter
9 under advisement and issued a Minute Order on November 24, 2015 which is attached hereto
10 as Exhibit "A".

11 The procedural history of this matter dates back to a decision by the Nevada Tax
12 Commission dated October 12, 2007 upholding the Live Entertainment Tax
13 (PJR-11-648894-J), a remand in January 2012 to allow the Commission to review additional
14 evidence and determine whether it would amend, affirm or reverse its 2007 decision and re-
15 open discovery to allow depositions (PJR 14-697515-J), and supplemental briefing to
16 determine whether the standard of review for the Live Entertainment Tax changed based on
17 the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015).

18 Based upon the pleadings and papers on file, after hearing oral argument, and good
19 cause appearing, the Court renders the following findings of fact:

- 20 1. The parties essentially agreed to the procedural history and underlying factual
21 background of this case.
- 22 2. The three issues before this Court were:
 - 23 a. Petition for Judicial Review of the Nevada Tax Commission October 12, 2007
24 decision denying Petitioners requests for refunds of Live Entertainment Tax
25 ("NLET") paid, and finding that the NLET does not violate the U.S.
26 Constitution or Nevada Constitution, is not targeted at gentlemen's clubs,
27 and is not a tax based on the content of the taxpayer's message.

- b. Petition for Judicial Review of the Nevada Tax Commission's decision dated September 6, 2012 finding that discovery would not be reopened to allow depositions, and decision on February 12, 2014 upholding the Hearing Officers Hearing on Remand finding that the more than 1,500 pages of supplemental materials were insufficient to cause the Commission's October 12, 2007 decision to be reversed or amended.
 - c. Petitioner's supplemental briefing claiming that the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Reed v. Gilbert Arizona changed the standard of review for determining the constitutionality of the Live Entertainment Tax to strict scrutiny.
 3. The Petitioners made the following arguments:
 - a. That the NLET is unconstitutional because it is a direct tax on First Amendment activities and is statutorily gerrymandered to apply only to a narrowly defined group of speakers, and in doing so discriminates based on the content of the entertainment;
 - b. The Commission should have permitted Petitioners to conduct the requested depositions in order to shed further light on the drafting and amending of the NLET and to identify the purpose for each and every one of the exceptions to the definition of live entertainment set forth in NRS 368A; and
 - c. Based on the recent ruling in Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, U.S. , 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015), strict scrutiny applies, and the NLET does not pass the constitutional muster because there is a differentiation of the application of a law based upon the content of the expression.
 4. The Department made the following arguments:
 - a. That the NLET is Constitutional revenue raising tax and not a tax on a First Amendment right, and the tax has not been applied to the Petitioners in an unconstitutional manner. The Nevada Supreme Court found that the NLET is

1 constitutional on its face in Deja Vu Showgirls v. Department of Taxation, 334
2 P.3d 392 (2014). In that case, the Nevada Supreme Court established that
3 the standard of review for the NLET is a rational basis analysis, because it
4 does not regulate live entertainment, it does not discriminate on the basis of
5 the taxpayers' speech, and it does not target a small group of speakers or
6 threaten to suppress viewpoints. Deja vu, 334 P.3d at 401;

- 7 b. That the Commission's decision on remand to deny depositions should be
8 upheld because, while NRS 233B.131(2) provides for additional evidence
9 under very specific conditions, it does not provide for additional evidence
10 after receiving an adverse decision. Moreover, the information that the
11 Petitioners were seeking was available in 2007. On January 24, 2012, the
12 Court remanded the case to the Commission for review of evidence, not to
13 allow additional evidence to be gathered; and
- 14 c. The standard used by the court to review a tax matter has been in place
15 more than 125 years and has not changed on the basis of a sign ordinance
16 case (Reed). The Court in Deja Vu had previously ruled that heightened
17 scrutiny does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile
18 and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes.

19 The Court made the following conclusions of law:

- 20 5. NRS 233B.135 indicates that the Court shall not substitute its judgment for that of
21 the agency as to the weight of evidence on a question of fact. NRS 233B.135(3).
- 22 6. Pursuant to NRS 233B.135(3), the Court can remand, affirm, or set aside the
23 Commission's decision if the substantial rights of the petitioner have been
24 prejudiced because the agency's decision is in violation of statutory provisions, in
25 excess of the statutory authority of the agency, made upon unlawful procedure,
26 affected by other error of law, clearly erroneous, or an arbitrary or capricious abuse
27 of discretion.
- 28

- 1 7. The Commission did not find Petitioner's argument with respect to reopening
2 discovery to allow depositions meritorious because all the information that
3 Petitioners sought recently was available prior to 2007, and the information sought
4 was consistently determined to be irrelevant. The Commission's decision did not
5 violate the constitution or a statute, was not in excess of its statutory authority, was
6 not made upon unlawful procedure, was not affected by other error of law, was not
7 clearly erroneous, and was not arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion.
8 These findings of fact by the Commission may not be disturbed by this Court. The
9 Commission's determination with regard to the request to take depositions is hereby
10 AFFIRMED.
- 11 8. The construction of a statute is a question of law, and therefore, independent review
12 is appropriate. However, the court will not readily disturb an administrative
13 interpretation of statutory language. City of Reno v. Reno Police Protective Ass'n.,
14 118 Nev. 889, 900 (2002). The Commission's determination that the NLET is
15 constitutional as applied to the Petitioners is supported by the fact that the Nevada
16 Supreme Court has determined that the NLET does not regulate live entertainment
17 and is simply a tax on a business transaction, and not a tax on the expressive
18 activity taking place within the facility.
- 19 9. Petitioners have failed to meet their burden to show that the NLET has attacked the
20 content of their message.
- 21 10. The Commission did not exceed their authority by concluding that NLET, as applied
22 to Petitioners, is not an impermissible differential tax, and does not place a burden
23 on a narrowly defined group of speakers.
- 24 11. Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona, 135 U.S. 2218 (2015), does not apply to tax
25 classification unless the classification is hostile and oppressive discrimination
26 against particular person and classes. This Court does not find any evidence here
27 that NLET triggers the application of Reed.
- 28

12. The Commission's decision that NLET is not a content-based tax on first amendment activity, but a legitimate tax scheme, evenly applied, and used to raise state revenue shall not be disturbed.

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing, this Court Orders that there was substantial evidence supporting the Commission's decisions and that the Commission's decisions did not violate NRS 233B.135, and consequently, the Commission's decisions are hereby AFFIRMED. The Petition for Judicial Review is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED this 13 day of January, 2016.


DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Respectfully Submitted By:


VIVENNE RAKOWSKY
Deputy Attorney General

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

CASE NO. A-11-648894-J

www.ck12.org

Number:

A-14-697515-J (Consolidated)

		Lead Attorneys David J. Pope Â Â Retained 7026568084(W)
Defendant	Nevada Department of Taxation	
Defendant	Nevada Tax Commission	David J. Pope Â Â Retained 7026568084(W)
Plaintiff	D I Food and Beverage of Las Vegas LLC	William H. Brown Â Â Retained 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	D Westwood Inc	William H. Brown Â Â Retained 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Deja Vu Showgirls of Las Vegas	William H. Brown Â Â Retained 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	K-Kel, Inc.	William H. Brown Â Â Retained 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Little Darlings of Las Vegas LLC	William H. Brown Â Â Retained 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Olympus Garden Inc	William H. Brown Â Â Retained 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Power Company Inc	William H. Brown Â Â Retained 702-816-2200(W)
Plaintiff	Shac LLC	William H. Brown Â Â Retained 702-816-2200(W)

11/24/2015 Minute Order (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer Wiese, Jerry A.)

Minutes

11/24/2015 9:00 AM

The above-referenced matter came before Judge Jerry Wiese with regard to a Petition for Judicial Review filed by Petitioners, K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino Gentlemen's Club, OLYMPUS GARDEN, INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden, SHAC, LLC d/b/a Sapphire, D. WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures, D J VU SHOWGIRLS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a D j vu and LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Little Darlings. Briefs were filed in this matter, and the Court also heard oral argument. After supplemental briefing regarding the Reed case, and after oral argument, the Court took the matter under advisement. Based upon the pleadings and papers on file, after hearing oral argument, and good cause appearing, the Court now renders the following decision: This Court will not reiterate the procedural history or the factual background of this case, as the parties essentially agree to the underlying facts. Petitioners argue that the Commission should have permitted Petitioners to conduct the requested depositions in order to shed further light on the drafting and amending of the NLET and to identify the purpose for each and every one of the exceptions to the definition of live entertainment set forth in NRS 368A. Petitioners also argue that NLET is unconstitutional because it is a direct tax on First Amendment activities and is statutorily gerrymandered to apply only to a narrowly defined group of speakers, and in doing so discriminates based on the content of the entertainment. Lastly, Petitioners argue that in light of the recent ruling in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona*, U.S. , 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015), the NLET does not pass the constitutional muster of strict scrutiny that now applies, whereas in this case, there is a differentiation of the application of a law based upon the content of expression. The Department of Taxation (Department) argues that the Commission's decision on remand to deny depositions should be upheld because, while NRS 233B.131(2) provides for additional evidence under very specific conditions, it does not provide for additional evidence after receiving an adverse decision. This Court remanded the case to the Commission for review of evidence, not to allow additional evidence to be gathered. The Department also argues that NLET is a Constitutional revenue raising tax and not a tax on a First Amendment right, and it has not been applied to the Petitioners in an unconstitutional manner. Furthermore, the Department notes that the Nevada Supreme Court found that the NLET is constitutional on its face in *D j Vu Showgirls v. Department of Taxation*, 334 P.3d 392 (2014). In that case, the Nevada Supreme Court established that the standard of review for the NLET is a rational basis analysis, because it does not regulate live entertainment, it does not discriminate on the basis of the taxpayers' speech, and it does not target a small group of speakers or threaten to suppress viewpoints. *D j vu*, 334 P.3d at 401. Finally, the Department argues that the standard of review for a tax matter has been in place more than 125 years and has not changed on the basis of a sign ordinance case (*Reed*). The Department argues that the Court in *D j Vu* ruled that heightened scrutiny does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes. NRS 233B.135 indicates that the Court shall not substitute its judgment for that of the agency as to the weight of evidence on a question of fact. (NRS 233B.135[3]). Pursuant to NRS 33B.135(3), the Court can remand, affirm, or set aside the Commission's decision if the substantial rights of the petitioner have been prejudiced because the agency's decision is in violation of statutory provisions, in excess of the statutory authority of the agency, made upon unlawful procedure, affected by other error of law, clearly erroneous, or an arbitrary or capricious abuse of discretion. The Commission did not find Petitioner's argument with respect to reopening discovery to allow depositions meritorious because all the information that Petitioners sought recently was available prior to 2007, and the information sought was consistently determined to be irrelevant. These are findings of fact by the Commission that may not be disturbed by this Court. The Court does not find that the Commission's determination violated the constitution or a statute, was in excess of its statutory authority, was made upon unlawful procedure, was affected by other error of law, was clearly erroneous, or was arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion. Consequently, the Commission's determination with regard to the request to take depositions, is hereby AFFIRMED. The construction of a statute is a question of law, and therefore, independent review is appropriate. However, this court will not readily disturb an administrative interpretation of statutory language. *City of Reno v. Reno Police Protective Ass'n*, 118 Nev. 889, 900 (2002). The Commission's determination that the NLET is constitutional as applied to the Petitioners is supported by the fact that the Nevada Supreme Court has determined that the NLET does not regulate live entertainment and is simply a tax on a business transaction, and not on the expressive activity taking place within the facility. Petitioners have failed to meet their burden to show that the NLET has attacked the content of their message. In addition, this Court finds that the Commission did not exceed their authority by concluding that NLET, as applied to Petitioners, is not an impermissible differential tax, and does not place a burden on a narrowly defined group of speakers. This court agrees that *Reed* does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes, which there is no

evidence of here. Therefore, the Commission's decision that NLET is not a content-based tax on first amendment activity, but a legitimate tax scheme, evenly applied, and used to raise state revenue shall not be disturbed. Based upon the foregoing, this Court concludes that there was substantial evidence supporting the Commission's decisions that the Commission's decisions did not violate NRS 233B.135, and consequently, the Commission's decisions are hereby AFFIRMED. The Petition for Judicial Review is DENIED. Respondent's counsel is to prepare an Order consistent with this Minute Order within 10 days, have it approved as to form and content by Petitioner's counsel, and submit to this Court for signature.

[Return to Register of Actions](#)

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial Review

COURT MINUTES

December 09, 2011

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

December 09, 2011 9:00 AM Motion for Leave

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14B

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT:	Brown, William H.	Attorney
	Doerr, Blake A.	Attorney
	Ferrario, Mark E., ESQ	Attorney
	Pope, David J.	Attorney
	RAKOWSKY, VIVIANNE, ESQ	Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Mr. Rakwosky noted there was a similar matter being heard in front of Judge Gonzalez. Arguments by Mr. Pope, Ms. Rakwosky, and Mr. Doerr. COURT ADVISED counsel the Administrative Agency should take the matter up first as the Court could only review the record provided. COURT ORDERED case REMANDED to the Administrative Agency to review evidence requested by the Petitioner.

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial
Review

COURT MINUTES

December 16, 2011

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

December 16, 2011 9:00 AM Motion to Dismiss

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14B

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

**PARTIES
PRESENT:**

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- There being no parties present. Court noted the motion was withdrawn as the parties indicated they were working to resolve the matter. Therefore, COURT ORDERED, matter OFF CALENDAR.

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial Review

COURT MINUTES

June 08, 2012

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

June 08, 2012 9:00 AM Motion For Stay

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14B

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

PARTIES

PRESENT: Brown, William H. Attorney
Doerr, Blake A. Attorney
Pope, David J. Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Colloquy regarding remand and continuing jurisdiction. Mr. Brown requested to stay the Administrative Hearing pending a ruling on appeal. Colloquy regarding similar cases, facial challenge and as it applies challenge. Opposition and statement regarding Judicial Review by Mr. Pope. COURT ORDERED, motion DENIED. Mr. Pope to prepare the order.

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial
Review

COURT MINUTES

October 15, 2013

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

October 15, 2013 9:00 AM Status Check

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14A

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

**PARTIES
PRESENT:**

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- There being no parties present. Court noted that it received correspondence from Lambrose/Brown Firm indicating the status of a remand. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED for further Status Check.

CONTINUED....4/15/14 9:00 AM

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial Review

COURT MINUTES

March 25, 2014

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

March 25, 2014 9:00 AM Status Check

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14A

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

PARTIES

PRESENT: Brown, William H. Attorney
Doerr, Blake A. Attorney
Pope, David J. Attorney
RAKOWSKY, VIVIENNE, ESQ Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Colloquy regarding constitutional challenge on tax. Statement by Mr. Brown regarding Petition for Judicial Review. Court suggested to wait until the Supreme Court ruled on that issue. Counsel stipulated to stay the case. COURT APPROVED of the stay pending the Supreme Court outcome. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED for further status check.

CONTINUED....9/23/14 9:00 AM

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial
Review

COURT MINUTES

September 23, 2014

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

September 23, 2014 9:00 AM Status Check

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14A

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

PARTIES

PRESENT: Brown, William H. Attorney
Doerr, Blake A. Attorney
Pope, David J. Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Counsel indicated the Supreme Court Affirmed the District Courts decision, therefore, would be creating a proposal. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED.

CONTINUED....10/21/14 9:00 AM

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial Review

COURT MINUTES

October 21, 2014

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

October 21, 2014 9:00 AM Status Check

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14A

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

PARTIES

PRESENT:	Brown, William H.	Attorney
	Doerr, Blake A.	Attorney
	Ferrario, Mark E., ESQ	Attorney
	Pope, David J.	Attorney
	RAKOWSKY, VIVIANNE, ESQ	Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Counsel stipulated to a briefing schedule for the Petition for Judicial Review. COURT ORDERED, matter SET oral argument.

4/23/15 9:00 am HEARING: Judicial Review

CLERK'S NOTE: Briefing schedule set as follows: Opening briefs due 1/20/15; Response 3/6/15; Reply 4/10/15; Decision/oral argument 4/23/15.

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial
Review

COURT MINUTES

September 22, 2015

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

September 22, 2015 9:00 AM Motion for Leave

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14A

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

PARTIES

PRESENT: Brown, William H. Attorney
 Pope, David J. Attorney
 RAKOWSKY, VIVIENNE, ESQ Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief Regarding New U.S. Supreme Court Precedent

There being no objection. COURT ORDERED, motion GRANTED. Briefing schedule set as followed:

10/6/15 Response

10/13/15 Reply

10/27/15 9:00 am Hearing: Petition for Judicial Review

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial Review

COURT MINUTES

October 27, 2015

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

October 27, 2015 9:00 AM Hearing

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14A

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

PARTIES

PRESENT:	Brown, William H.	Attorney
	Ferrario, Mark E., ESQ	Attorney
	Pope, David J.	Attorney
	RAKOWSKY, VIVIENNE, ESQ	Attorney

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Following arguments by counsel regarding facial challenge of live entertainment tax and first amendment right. COURT ORDERED, matter UNDER ADVISEMENT and will issue a written order from Chambers.

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Civil Petition for Judicial
Review

COURT MINUTES

November 24, 2015

A-11-648894-J K-Kel, Inc., Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Nevada Department of Taxation, Defendant(s)

November 24, 2015 9:00 AM Minute Order

HEARD BY: Wiese, Jerry A.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14A

COURT CLERK: Alice Jacobson

RECORDER:

REPORTER: Kristy Clark

**PARTIES
PRESENT:**

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- The above-referenced matter came before Judge Jerry Wiese with regard to a Petition for Judicial Review filed by Petitioners, K-KEL, INC., d/b/a Spearmint Rhino Gentlemen s Club, OLYMPUS GARDEN, INC., d/b/a Olympic Garden, SHAC, LLC d/b/a Sapphire, D. WESTWOOD, INC., d/b/a Treasures, D J VU SHOWGIRLS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a D j vu and LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC, d/b/a Little Darlings. Briefs were filed in this matter, and the Court also heard oral argument. After supplemental briefing regarding the Reed case, and after oral argument, the Court took the matter under advisement. Based upon the pleadings and papers on file, after hearing oral argument, and good cause appearing, the Court now renders the following decision:

This Court will not reiterate the procedural history or the factual background of this case, as the parties essentially agree to the underlying facts.

Petitioners argue that the Commission should have permitted Petitioners to conduct the requested depositions in order to shed further light on the drafting and amending of the NLET and to identify the purpose for each and every one of the exceptions to the definition of live entertainment set forth in NRS 368A. Petitioners also argue that NLET is unconstitutional because it is a direct tax on First Amendment activities and is statutorily gerrymandered to apply only to a narrowly defined group of speakers, and in doing so discriminates based on the content of the entertainment. Lastly,

PRINT DATE: 03/01/2016

Page 10 of 12

Minutes Date: December 09, 2011

Petitioners argue that in light of the recent ruling in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona*, _U.S._, 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015), the NLET does not pass the constitutional muster of strict scrutiny that now applies, whereas in this case, there is a differentiation of the application of a law based upon the content of expression.

The Department of Taxation (Department) argues that the Commission s decision on remand to deny depositions should be upheld because, while NRS 233B.131(2) provides for additional evidence under very specific conditions, it does not provide for additional evidence after receiving an adverse decision. This Court remanded the case to the Commission for review of evidence, not to allow additional evidence to be gathered. The Department also argues that NLET is a Constitutional revenue raising tax and not a tax on a First Amendment right, and it has not been applied to the Petitioners in an unconstitutional manner. Furthermore, the Department notes that the Nevada Supreme Court found that the NLET is constitutional on its face in *D j Vu Showgirls v. Department of Taxation*, 334 P.3d 392 (2014). In that case, the Nevada Supreme Court established that the standard of review for the NLET is a rational basis analysis, because it does not regulate live entertainment, it does not discriminate on the basis of the taxpayers' speech, and it does not target a small group of speakers or threaten to suppress viewpoints. *D j vu*, 334 P.3d at 401. Finally, the Department argues that the standard of review for a tax matter has been in place more than 125 years and has not changed on the basis of a sign ordinance case (*Reed*). The Department argues that the Court in *D j Vu* ruled that heightened scrutiny does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes. NRS 233B.135 indicates that the Court shall not substitute its judgment for that of the agency as to the weight of evidence on a question of fact. (NRS 233B.135[3]). Pursuant to NRS 33B.135(3), the Court can remand, affirm, or set aside the Commission s decision if the substantial rights of the petitioner have been prejudiced because the agency s decision is in violation of statutory provisions, in excess of the statutory authority of the agency, made upon unlawful procedure, affected by other error of law, clearly erroneous, or an arbitrary or capricious abuse of discretion. The Commission did not find Petitioner s argument with respect to reopening discovery to allow depositions meritorious because all the information that Petitioners sought recently was available prior to 2007, and the information sought was consistently determined to be irrelevant. These are findings of fact by the Commission that may not be disturbed by this Court. The Court does not find that the Commission s determination violated the constitution or a statute, was in excess of its statutory authority, was made upon unlawful procedure, was affected by other error of law, was clearly erroneous, or was arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion. Consequently, the Commission s determination with regard to the request to take depositions, is hereby AFFIRMED.

The construction of a statute is a question of law, and therefore, independent review is appropriate. However, this court will not readily disturb an administrative interpretation of statutory language. *City of Reno v. Reno Police Protective Ass n.*, 118 Nev. 889, 900 (2002). The Commission s determination that the NLET is constitutional as applied to the Petitioners is supported by the fact that the Nevada Supreme Court has determined that the NLET does not regulate live entertainment and is simply a tax on a business transaction, and not on the expressive activity taking place within the facility. Petitioners have failed to meet their burden to show that the NLET has attacked the content of their message. In addition, this Court finds that the Commission did not exceed their authority by concluding that NLET, as applied to Petitioners, is not an impermissible differential tax,

and does not place a burden on a narrowly defined group of speakers. This court agrees that Reed does not apply to tax classification unless the classification is hostile and oppressive discrimination against particular person and classes, which there is no evidence of here. Therefore, the Commission's decision that NLET is not a content-based tax on first amendment activity, but a legitimate tax scheme, evenly applied, and used to raise state revenue shall not be disturbed.

Based upon the foregoing, this Court concludes that there was substantial evidence supporting the Commission's decisions that the Commission's decisions did not violate NRS 233B.135, and consequently, the Commission's decisions are hereby AFFIRMED. The Petition for Judicial Review is DENIED.

Respondent's counsel is to prepare an Order consistent with this Minute Order within 10 days, have it approved as to form and content by Petitioner's counsel, and submit to this Court for signature.

Certification of Copy

State of Nevada }
County of Clark } SS:

I, Steven D. Grierson, the Clerk of the Court of the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of the hereinafter stated original document(s):

NOTICE OF APPEAL; CASE APPEAL STATEMENT; NOTICE OF DEPOSITING SECURITY FOR COSTS ON APPEAL; REQUEST FOR TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS ON APPEAL; DISTRICT COURT DOCKET ENTRIES; CIVIL COVER SHEET; ORDER DENYING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION; NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION; DISTRICT COURT MINUTES

K-KEL, INC. dba SPEARMENT RHINO GENTLEMEN'S CLUB; OLYMPUS GARDEN, INC. dba OLYMPIC GARDEN; SHAC, LLC dba SAPPHIRE; THE POWER COMPANY, INC. dba CRAZY HORSE TOO GENTLEMEN'S CLUB; D. WESTWOOD, INC. dba TREASURES; D.I. FOOD & BEVERAGE OF LAS VEGAS, LLC dba SCORES; DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC dba DEJA VU; LITTLE DARLINGS OF LAS VEGAS, LLC dba LITTLE DARLINGS,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION;
NEVADA TAX COMMISSION,

Defendant(s),

Case No: A648894

Consolidated with A697515

Dept No: XXXI

now on file and of record in this office.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto
Set my hand and Affixed the seal of the
Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada
This 1 day of March 2016


Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Heather Ungermann", is written over a horizontal line.


Heather Ungermann, Deputy Clerk

1171

LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM H BROWN

6029 S FORT APACHE RD STE 100
LAS VEGAS, NV 89148-5563DATE 2-25-16 94-169-1212PAY TO THE ORDER OF Clerk of the Supreme Court \$ 250.00
TWO-HUNDRED FIFTY DOLLARS  Security Features
Included
Details on Back

All of us serving you®

FOR APPEAL AW48894William Brown  MP

⑈001171⑈ ⑆121201694⑆ 153754821277⑈