

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAMES NALDER, GUARDIAN AD
LITEM ON BEHALF OF CHEYANNE
NALDER; AND GARY LEWIS,
INDIVIDUALLY,
Appellants,
vs.
UNITED AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE
COMPANY,
Respondent.

No. 70504

FILED

FEB 23 2018

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER ACCEPTING SECOND CERTIFIED QUESTION AND
DIRECTING SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING*

The United States Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals previously certified a legal question to this court under NRAP 5, asking us to answer the following question:

Whether, under Nevada law, the liability of an insurer that has breached its duty to defend, but has not acted in bad faith, is capped at the policy limit plus any costs incurred by the insured in mounting a defense, or is the insurer liable for all losses consequential to the insurer's breach?

Because no clearly controlling Nevada precedent answers that legal question and the answer could determine part of the federal case, we accepted that certified question and directed the parties to file briefs addressing that question. After briefing had been completed, respondent United Automobile Insurance Company informed this court that it had filed a motion to dismiss in the federal case. We then stayed our consideration of the certified question because a decision by the Ninth Circuit granting the motion to dismiss would render the question before this court advisory.

The Ninth Circuit has now certified another legal question to this court under NRAP 5. The new question, which is related to the motion to dismiss pending in the Ninth Circuit, asks us to answer the following:

Under Nevada law, if a plaintiff has filed suit against an insurer seeking damages based on a separate judgment against its insured, does the insurer's liability expire when the statute of limitations on the judgment runs, notwithstanding that the suit was filed within the six-year life of the judgment?


That question is focused on the insurer's liability, but elsewhere in the Ninth Circuit's certification order, it makes clear that the court is concerned with whether the plaintiff in this scenario can continue to seek the amount of the separate judgment against the insured as consequential damages caused by the insurer's breach of the duty to defend its insured when the separate judgment was not renewed as contemplated by NRS 11.190(1)(a) and NRS 17.214 during the pendency of the action against the insurer. We therefore choose to accept the Ninth Circuit's invitation to "rephrase the question as [we] deem necessary." Consistent with language that appears elsewhere in the certification order, we rephrase the question as follows:

In an action against an insurer for breach of the duty to defend its insured, can the plaintiff continue to seek consequential damages in the amount of a default judgment obtained against the insured when the judgment against the insured was not renewed and the time for doing so expired while the action against the insurer was pending?


As no clearly controlling Nevada precedent answers this legal question and the answer may determine the federal case, we accept this certified question as rephrased. See NRAP 5(a); *Volvo Cars of N. Am., Inc. v. Ricci*, 122 Nev. 746, 749-51, 137 P.3d 1161, 1163-64 (2006).


Appellants shall have 30 days from the date of this order to file and serve a supplemental opening brief. Respondent shall have 30 days from the date the supplemental opening brief is served to file and serve a supplemental answering brief. Appellants shall then have 20 days from the date the supplemental answering brief is served to file and serve any supplemental reply brief. The supplemental briefs shall be limited to addressing the second certified question and shall comply with NRAP 28, 28.2, 31(c), and 32. See NRAP 5(g)(2). To the extent that there are portions of the record that have not already been provided to this court and are necessary for this court to resolve the second certified question, the parties may submit a joint appendix containing those additional documents. See NRAP 5(d). Given the relationship between the two certified questions, we lift the stay as to the first certified question.


It is so ORDERED.¹


, C.J.
Douglas

, J.
Gibbons

, J.
Hardesty

, J.
Cherry

, J.
Pickering

, J.
Stiglich

¹As the parties have already paid a filing fee when this court accepted the first certified question, no additional filing fee will be assessed at this time.

The Honorable Ron D. Parraguirre, Justice, voluntarily recused himself from participation in the decision of this matter.

cc: Eglet Prince
Christensen Law Offices, LLC
Atkin Winner & Sherrod
Cole, Scott & Kissane, P.A.
Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP/Las Vegas
Pursiano Barry Bruce Lavelle, LLP
Laura Anne Foggan
Mark Andrew Boyle
Matthew L. Sharp, Ltd.
Clerk, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit