TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES(S) PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	2
ARGUMENT	2-4
CONCLUSION	4-5
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	5-6
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	6
I. ISSUE IN REPLY BRIEF: A RETAINING LIEN DO FURNISH THE BASIS FOR A MONETARY JUDG!	
II. ARGUMENT	
In this case, the District Court had the ability to enforce a retain	ning lien, bu
not enter a monetary judgment based upon a retaining lien. As stated	in
Respondent's Answering Brief, Leventhal ¹ was decided after NRS 18	.015(1)(b)
came into effect. This fact, specifically the timing of Leventhal, streng	gthens
Appellant's argument, not weakens it as Respondent asserts.	
Respondent asserted a retaining lien only, and requests this Cou	art to hold
that a retaining lien filed after the Leventhal decision trumps Leventhal	al and
provides a vehicle by which a retaining lien is expanded to create a m	onetary
judgment. Respondent fails to offer any statutory support or case auth	nority to

¹ Leventhal v. Black & LoBello, 305 P.3d 907, 909 (Nev. 2013).

support her position. Instead, Respondent merely offers a historical timeline and inexplicably notes that *Leventhal* was decided after NRS 18.015 added section (1) (b), which provides for a retaining lien. Pursuant to section 4 of NRS 18.015, the lien "attaches to any verdict, judgment or decree entered and to any money or property which is recovered on account of the suit or other action," and pursuant to section 6 of NRS 18.015, "On motion filed by an attorney having a lien under this section, the attorney's client or any party who has been served with notice of the lien, the court shall, after 5 days' notice to all interested parties, adjudicate the rights of the attorney, client or other parties and enforce the lien.

Subsection 6 of NRS 18.015 does not provide that a retaining lien may be reduced to a monetary judgment when nothing was recovered, and *Leventhal* bolsters Appellant's argument. The District Court is not statutorily empowered to enforce a retaining lien by entering a monetary judgment.

While the Respondent is free to use those remedies available to creditors, *Leventhal* is controlling and not relied upon in error by Appellant. As this Court held in *Leventhal*, at 909:

Nevada attorneys have all the usual tools available to creditors to recover payment of their fees. For example, a law firm can sue its client and obtain a money judgment for fees due, thereby acquiring, if recorded, a judgment lien against the client's property. NRS 17.150(2). An attorney also has a passive or retaining lien against files or property held by the attorney for the client. See Argentena Consol. Mining Co. v. Jolley Urga Wirth Woodbury & Standish, 125 Nev. 527, 532, 216 P.3d 779, 782 (2009). Finally, in an

appropriate case, an attorney may assert a charging lien against the client's claim or recovery under NRS 18.015. *Id.; see* NRS 18.015(5) ("Collection of attorney's fees by a [charging] lien under this section may be utilized with, after or independently of any other method of collection.")."

If Respondent is holding files or property, she is free to retain them. However, the perfection of a retaining lien does not render *Leventhal* inapplicable and a retaining lien does not empower a District Court to enter a monetary judgment. No monetary recovery was obtained in the underlying action and there was nothing for a retaining lien to attach to, other than papers and files left in the attorney's possession.

III. CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court find that the District Court erred by entering a money judgment/lien against Appellant in a paternity action involving custody and visitation issues upon which no lien could attach, after the final entry of a custodial/visitation order and that pursuant to the foregoing this Honorable Court remand the matter for proceedings consistent with

its orders, and for any further relief that is warranted.

Dated this 14th day of November 2016.

PATRICIA A. MARR, LTD.

/s/ Patricia A. Marr, Esq.
PATRICIA A. MARR, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 008846
2470 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 106
Henderson, Nevada 89074
(702) 353-4225 (telephone)
(702) 912-0088 (facsimile)
patricia@marrlawlv.com
Attorney for Appellant

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO NRAP 28A

- I, Patricia A. Marr, Esq., certify pursuant to NRAP 28A:
- 1. That I have read this brief;
- 2. That to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, the brief is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation; and
- 3. That this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate

 Procedure, including the requirement of Rule 28(e) that every assertion in
 the briefs regarding matters in the record be supported by a reference to the
 page of the appendix where the matter relied on is to be found.
- 4. That this brief complies with NRAP 32 (a) (5) in that it is in 14 Point Times

1	
2	New Roman Font, and is less than 14 pages.
3	Dated this 14 th day of November, 2016.
4	
5	PATRICIA A. MARR, LTD.
6	/s/ Patricia A. Marr, Esq
7	PATRICIA A. MARR, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 008846
8	2470 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 106 Henderson, Nevada 89074
9	(702) 353-4225 (telephone)
10	(702) 912-0088 (facsimile) patricia@marrlawlv.com
11	Attorney for Appellant
12	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
13	I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing <i>Appellant's Reply Brief</i>
14	THEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the folegoing Appendin s Reply Brief
15	was sent by first class mail, postage prepaid, to the following parties on the 10 th
16	day of November, 2016.
17	Corinne Price, Esq.
18	FINE/CARMAN/PRICE
19	8965 South Pecos Rd, Ste. 9 Henderson, Nevada 89074
20	Cohaction Moutines
21	Sebastian Martinez 261 Lenape Heights
22	Las Vegas, Nevada 89148
23	
24	/s/Patricia A. Marr
25	
	An employee of Patricia A. Marr, Ltd