

1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2 * * * *

3 JAMES D. BALODIMAS, M.D.;
4 JAMES D. BALODIMAS, M.D., PC;
5 LAS VEGAS RADIOLOGY, LLC, a
6 Nevada Limited Liability Company;
7 BRUCE A. KATUNA, M.D.; ROCKY
8 MOUNTAIN NEURODIAGNOSTICS,
9 LLC, a Colorado Limited Liability
10 Company; ANDREW M. CASH, M.D.;
11 ANDREW M. CASH, M.D., P.C. aka
12 ANDREW MILLER CASH, M.D., P.C.;
13 and DESERT INSTITUTE OF SPINE
14 CARE, LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability
15 Company,

16 Petitioners,

17 vs.

18 THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
19 COURT, of the State of Nevada, in and
20 for the County of Clark, and the
21 HONORABLE JERRY A. WIESE,
22 District Court Judge,

23 Respondents

24 REPUBLIC SILVER STATE
25 DISPOSAL, INC., a Nevada
26 Corporation; JAMES D. BALODIMAS,
27 M.D.; JAMES D. BALODIMAS, M.D.,
28 P.C.; DANIELLE MILLER aka
DANIELLE SHOPSHIRE;
NEUROMONITORING ASSOCIATES,
INC.,

Real Parties in Interest.

SUPREME COURT CASE NO.:
72123

Electronically Filed
May 11 2017 02:36 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR STAY UNDER NRAP 27(e)
(ACTION IS NECESSARY BY MAY 22, 2017)

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

I.

INTRODUCTION

These Petitioners respectfully move this Court to stay the District Court proceedings pending resolution of their Petition for Writ of Mandamus (“Petition”). The Petition presents an important question as to the effect of a settlement agreement on subsequently asserted claims for contribution against medical providers alleged to have exacerbated injuries in a personal injury case. If the Petition is granted, the entirety of the underlying litigation will be concluded. In addition to resolving an important issue of law, the object of the Petition is to eliminate unnecessary litigation. However, that object will be defeated unless this Court stays the District Court proceedings while it considers the Petition.

II.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Petitioners are the Defendants in the underlying action entitled *Republic Silver State Disposal, Inc. v. Andrew Cash, M.D., et al.*, District Court Case No. A-16-738123-C. In its Complaint, Real Party in Interest Republic Silver State Disposal, Inc. (“Republic”) alleged the following causes of action: (1) medical negligence; (2) respondeat superior; (3) negligent supervision and retention; and (4) contribution. The District Court granted Defendants’ motion and dismissed the first three causes of action, but allowed the contribution claim to remain. On

1 January 13, 2017, the Petition was filed requesting that this Court direct the
2 District Court to grant the Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings
3 regarding Republic's claim for contribution. A copy of the Petition is attached
4 hereto as **Exhibit "A"**. Thereafter, this Court ordered Republic to answer the
5 Petition. Republic's answer and Petitioners' corresponding reply have been filed,
6 and the Petition is now fully briefed before this Court.
7
8

9 As stated in the Petition, Republic's alleged claim for contribution was
10 premised upon a settlement agreement between Republic and a claimant named
11 Marie Gonzalez for personal injuries sustained in an automobile accident. *Id.* at 4.
12 These Petitioners, among others, provided medical care to Ms. Gonzalez after the
13 automobile accident. *Id.* at 4-5. Following Republic's settlement with Ms.
14 Gonzalez, Republic asserted claims for medical negligence against the various
15 medical providers involved in Ms. Gonzalez's care. *Id.* at 5-6. Notably, at the
16 time of the settlement between Republic and Ms. Gonzalez, any potential
17 malpractice claim by Ms. Gonzalez against the various medical providers was
18 already time-barred by the applicable statute of limitations. *Id.* at 10.
19
20
21
22

23 In the District Court, Defendants moved to stay proceedings pending this
24 Court's decision on the Petition. On April 18, 2017, the District Court denied the
25 motion for stay stating that the issue should be addressed by this Court. *See*
26
27
28

1 Minutes from April 18, 2017 Hearing, attached hereto as **Exhibit “B”**.¹ Soon after
2 the District Court’s decision, Republic served its first set of interrogatories,
3 requests for production of documents, and requests for admissions upon Petitioner
4 Dr. Cash. It is further anticipated that Republic will attempt to schedule the
5 deposition of Dr. Cash at any moment. Republic is apparently intent on
6 conducting burdensome discovery in this case despite the meritorious Petition
7 pending before this Court. In order to allow this Court sufficient time to consider
8 the issues raised by the Petition, and avoid needless participation in a litigation in
9 which these Petitioners should not be parties, these Petitioners respectfully request
10 that this Court issue a stay of the District Court proceedings pending resolution of
11 the Petition.
12
13
14
15

16 **III.**

17 **ARGUMENT**

18 **A. THE DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDINGS SHOULD BE STAYED** 19 **PENDING RESOLUTION OF THE PETITION**

20 In addressing the Petition, this Court may conclusively resolve Republic’s
21 claim for contribution, which is the only claim remaining in the underlying
22 litigation. Thus, a stay of the District Court proceedings pending this Court’s
23 resolution of the Petition would result in “economy of time and effort for itself, for
24 counsel, and for litigants.” *Maheu v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 89 Nev. 214,
25
26

27 ¹ The District Court has not yet issued its formal Order denying the motion for stay. Such Order will be provided to
28 this Court upon receipt of the same.

1 217, 510 P.2d 627 (1973) (citing *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248,
2 254-55 (1936)). That economy would not be realized, however, if litigation
3 continues on a claim that is not authorized by Nevada law.
4

5 NRAP 8(c) enumerates factors the Court may consider in determining
6 whether a stay is warranted and provides as follows:
7

8 (c) Stays in Civil Cases Not Involving Child Custody. In deciding
9 whether to issue a stay or injunction, the Supreme Court or Court of
10 Appeals will generally consider the following factors: (1) whether the
11 object of the appeal or writ petition will be defeated if the stay or
12 injunction is denied; (2) whether appellant/petitioner will suffer
13 irreparable or serious injury if the stay or injunction is denied; (3)
14 whether respondent/real party in interest will suffer irreparable or
15 serious injury if the stay or injunction is granted; and (4) whether
16 appellant/petitioner is likely to prevail on the merits in the appeal or
17 writ petition.

18 A stay of the District Court proceedings is appropriate. First, if a stay is
19 denied, the object of the Petition would certainly be defeated. The Petition
20 challenges the District Court's denial of the Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings.
21 If the Petition is granted – as Petitioners believe the law requires – the case would
22 be over and the numerous parties herein would no longer be participating in this
23 litigation. In light of Republic's insistence upon immediately conducting
24 significant discovery despite the pending Petition, there is a likelihood that these
25 Petitioners will be forced to incur unnecessary litigation costs in response to such
26 premature discovery. Requiring these Petitioners to continue litigating a case in
27
28

1 which they should not be a party would undeniably defeat the object of the
2 Petition.
3

4 Additionally, these Petitioners would suffer irreparable harm should a stay
5 be denied. Resolution of the Petition may potentially conclude this litigation in its
6 entirety. Without a stay, in addition to incurring unnecessary litigation expenses,
7 these Petitioners will be forced to participate in a litigation in which they should
8 not be parties. There will also be a potential impact on the insurability, claims
9 history, and insurance premiums of the individual physicians. In contrast, there is
10 no harm to Republic in granting a stay. The only possible harm to Republic would
11 be a delay in pursuing discovery, which this Court has held not to constitute
12 irreparable harm. *See Mikohn Gaming Corp. v. McCrea*, 120 Nev. 248, 253, 89
13 P.3d 36, 39 (2004) (“[A] mere delay in pursuing discovery and litigation normally
14 does not constitute irreparable harm.”).
15
16
17

18 Indeed, a stay of the District Court proceedings would further judicial
19 economy as the trial of this matter is not scheduled to begin until August 20, **2018**.
20 A stay would prevent the parties from incurring potentially unnecessary litigation
21 costs and participating in burdensome discovery prior to this Court’s resolution of
22 the Petition, while still allowing sufficient time for the parties to conduct discovery
23 should the Petition be denied. Notably, Republic’s Complaint was filed on June 8,
24
25
26
27
28

1 2016 and the time to bring this case to trial has not yet expired under NRCP 41 or
2 NRS 41A.061.

3
4 Finally, these Petitioners firmly believe that there is a high likelihood of
5 prevailing on the merits of the Petition. The subject of the Petition is the
6 interpretation of NRS 17.225 and the effect of a settlement agreement on a claim
7 for contribution as it applies to the facts of this case. The issue presented in the
8 Petition is stated as follows:
9

10 Does a settling tortfeasor have a claim for contribution against a non-
11 party/non-settling defendant, where operation of law extinguishes the
12 potential liability between the underlying Plaintiff and the non-party
13 Defendant, prior to the settlement between the settling tortfeasor and
14 the underlying Plaintiff?

15 See **Exhibit “A”** at 7.

16 As stated in more detail in the Petition, the language of NRS 17.225(3)
17 unambiguously provides that unless the settling tortfeasor extinguishes the liability
18 of the non-settling alleged tortfeasor by the settlement agreement, there is no claim
19 for contribution. See **Exhibit “A”** at 9-10. Because any potential malpractice
20 claim against these Petitioners was time-barred at the time Republic had entered
21 into its settlement agreement with the claimant, the settlement agreement did not
22 operate to extinguish any alleged claim against the non-settling Petitioners as any
23 such alleged claim had already been extinguished by operation of law.² *Id.* at 10-
24
25
26
27

28 ² These Petitioners firmly deny any liability in tort to Ms. Gonzalez.

1 11. In light of the clear language of NRS 17.225, these Petitioners firmly believe
2 there is a high likelihood of success on the merits of the Petition.
3

4 In addition, this Court has stated that while “a movant does not always have
5 to show a probability of success on the merits, the movant must ‘present a
6 substantial case on the merits when a serious legal question is involved and show
7 that a balance of equities weighs heavily in favor of granting the stay.’” *Fritz*
8 *Hansen A/S v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 116 Nev. 650, 659, 6 P.3d 982, 987
9 (2000) (citing *Ruiz v. Estelle*, 650 F.2d 555, 565 (5th Cir. 1981)). The Petition
10 presents an important issue regarding claims for contribution against medical
11 providers alleged to have negligently exacerbated injuries in a personal injury case.
12 Because resolution of such issue would have a broad impact on medical
13 malpractice litigation in general, a stay of the District Court proceedings is
14 appropriate pending resolution of the Petition.
15
16
17

18 **B. EMERGENCY RELIEF IS WARRANTED**

19

20 Pursuant to NRAP 27(e), these Petitioners submit that to avoid irreparable
21 harm, relief is needed by **May 22, 2017**. Responses to Republic’s pending written
22 discovery requests are currently due on or before May 31, 2017. Prompt resolution
23 of this issue is needed in order to avoid unnecessary and burdensome participation
24 in a litigation in which these Petitioners should not be parties.
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


IV.

CONCLUSION

Resolution of the Petition will conclude the underlying litigation in its entirety. For the reasons stated herein, these Petitioners respectfully request that the Court grant the instant Emergency Motion for Stay and order a stay of the District Court proceedings pending resolution of the Petition currently before this Court. Doing so will serve judicial economy, further the object of the Petition, and allow this Court to resolve an important question of law.

DATED this 11th day of May, 2017.

CARROLL, KELLY, TROTTER,
FRANZEN, McKENNA & PEABODY

 #13596

ROBERT C. MCBRIDE, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No.: 7082
HEATHER S. HALL, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No.: 10608
8329 W. Sunset Road, Suite 260
Las Vegas, Nevada 89113
Attorneys for Petitioners,
Andrew M. Cash, M.D.; Andrew M. Cash,
M.D., P.C. aka Andrew Miller Cash, M.D.,
P.C.; & Desert Institute of Spine Care, LLC

NRAP 27(e) CERTIFICATE

(A) ATTORNEYS/PARTIES

Adam Laxalt, Esq.
Attorney General
NEVADA DEPARTMENT
OF JUSTICE
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
(775) 684-1100

*Counsel for Respondent/Real Party
in Interest The Honorable Jerry A.
Wiese*

The Honorable Jerry A. Wiese
EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
Department XXX
REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
(702) 671-3633

David Barron, Esq.
John D. Barron, Esq.
BARRON & PRUITT, LLP
3890 West Ann Road
North Las Vegas, NV 89031
(702) 870-3940

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Kim Irene Mandelbaum, Esq.
Marie Ellerton, Esq.
MANDELBAUM, ELLERTON &
ASSOCIATES
2012 Hamilton Lane
Las Vegas, NV 89106
(702) 367-1234

*Attorneys for Defendant
Las Vegas Radiology, LLC*

James Murphy, Esq.
LAXALT & NOMURA
6720 Via Austi Parkway,
Suite 430
Las Vegas, NV 89119
(702) 388-1551

*Attorneys for Defendant
Neuromonitoring Associates, Inc.*

John H. Cotton, Esq.
Michael D. Navratil, Esq.
JOHN H. COTTON & ASSOCIATES,
LTD.
7900 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 200
Las Vegas, NV 89117
(702) 832-5909

*Attorneys for Defendant
Balodimas, M.D. and Balodimas, M.D.,
P.C.*

James Olsen, Esq.
OLSON CANNON GORMLEY
ANGULO & STOBERSKI
9950 W. Cheyenne Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89129
(702) 384-4012
Attorneys for Defendant
Katuna, M.D. and Rocky Mountain
Neurodiagnostics, LLC

Anthony Lauria, Esq.
LAURIA TOKUNAGA
GATES & LINN, LLP
601 South Seventh Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 387-8633
Attorneys for Defendant
Danielle Miller a/k/a Danielle Shopshire

(B) Currently pending before this Court is Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Mandamus. On March 3, 2017 Petitioners filed a Motion for Stay Pending Decision on Petition for Writ of Mandamus before the District Court, which was heard and denied by the District Court on April 18, 2017. Soon thereafter, Republic served its first set of interrogatories, requests for production of documents, and requests for admissions on Petitioner Andrew M. Cash, M.D. It is further anticipated that Republic will attempt to schedule the deposition of Dr. Cash at any moment. Republic is patently intent on needlessly rushing discovery in the underlying action, despite the meritorious Petition for Writ of Mandamus still pending before this Court. Responses to Republic's written discovery requests are due on or before May 31, 2017. Accordingly, emergency intervention is necessary.


///

///

1 (C) The instant Motion was served upon the parties in accordance with the
2 Certificate of Service Below.

3
4 DATED this 11th day of May, 2017

5 CARROLL, KELLY, TROTTER,
6 FRANZEN, McKENNA & PEABODY

7
8  13596
9 ROBERT C. MCBRIDE, ESQ.
10 Nevada Bar No.: 7082
11 HEATHER S. HALL, ESQ.
12 Nevada Bar No.: 10608
13 8329 W. Sunset Road, Suite 260
14 Las Vegas, Nevada 89113
15 *Attorneys for Petitioners,*
16 *Andrew M. Cash, M.D.; Andrew M. Cash,*
17 *M.D., P.C. aka Andrew Miller Cash, M.D.,*
18 *P.C.; & Desert Institute of Spine Care, LLC*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **NRAP 28.2 ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

2 1. I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting
3 requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and
4 the type style requirements of NRAP 32 (a)(6) because:
5

6 [X] It has been prepared in proportionally spaced typeface using Word in
7
8 14 point Times New Roman Font.

9 2. I further certify that this brief complies with the page-or type-volume
10 limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by
11 NRAP 32(a)(7)(C), it is:
12

13 [X] Proportionally spaced, has a typeface font of 14 points or more, and
14 contains 235 words.
15

16 3. I hereby certify that I have read the preceding document, and to the
17 best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for
18 any improper purposes. I further certify that this brief complies with all applicable
19 Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e), which requires
20 every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported to a
21 reference to the page of the transcript or appendix where the matter relied on is to
22 be found.
23
24

25 I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the
26 accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements to the Nevada
27
28

1 Rules of Appellate Procedure.

2 DATED this 11th day of May, 2017.

3
4 CARROLL, KELLY, TROTTER,
FRANZEN, McKENNA & PEABODY

5
6  #13596
7 ROBERT C. MCBRIDE, ESQ.

8 Nevada Bar No.: 7082

9 HEATHER S. HALL, ESQ.

10 Nevada Bar No.: 10608

8329 W. Sunset Road, Suite 260

Las Vegas, Nevada 89113

Attorneys for Petitioners,

Andrew M. Cash, M.D.; Andrew M. Cash,

M.D., P.C. aka Andrew Miller Cash, M.D.,

P.C.; & Desert Institute of Spine Care, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 11th day of May, 2017, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **EMERGENCY MOTION FOR STAY UNDER NRAP 27(e)** was electronically filed and served in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

Adam Laxalt, Esq. Attorney General NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701 <i>Counsel for Respondent/Real Party in Interest The Honorable Jerry A. Wiese</i>	(Via Hand Delivery) The Honorable Jerry A. Wiese EIGHT JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT Department XXX REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 <i>Respondent</i>
David Barron, Esq. John D. Barron, Esq. BARRON & PRUITT, LLP 3890 West Ann Road North Las Vegas, NV 89031 <i>Attorneys for Plaintiff</i>	Kim Irene Mandelbaum, Esq. Marie Ellerton, Esq. MANDELBAUM, ELLERTON & ASSOCIATES 2012 Hamilton Lane Las Vegas, NV 89106 <i>Attorneys for Defendant Las Vegas Radiology, LLC</i>
James Murphy, Esq. LAXALT & NOMURA 6720 Via Austi Parkway, Suite 430 Las Vegas, NV 89119 <i>Attorneys for Defendant Neuromonitoring Associates, Inc.</i>	John H. Cotton, Esq. Michael D. Navratil, Esq. JOHN H. COTTON & ASSOCIATES, LTD. 7900 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 200 Las Vegas, NV 89117 <i>Attorneys for Defendant Balodimas, M.D. and Balodimas, M.D., P.C.</i>

James Olsen, Esq.
OLSON CANNON GORMLEY
ANGULO & STOBERSKI
9950 W. Cheyenne Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89129
*Attorneys for Defendant
Katuna, M.D. and Rocky Mountain
Neurodiagnostics, LLC*

Anthony Lauria, Esq.
LAURIA TOKUNAGA
GATES & LINN, LLP
601 South Seventh Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
*Attorneys for Defendant
Danielle Miller a/k/a Danielle Shopshire*

Kenee Canaan

An Employee of CARROLL, KELLY, ROTTER,
FRANZEN, McKENNA & PEABODY

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

1 **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

2 JAMES D. BALODIMAS, M.D., and
3 JAMES D. BALODIMAS, M.D., P.C.,

4 Petitioners,

5 vs.

6 THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
7 COURT of the State of Nevada, in and for
8 the County of Clark, and the HONORABLE
9 JERRY A. WIESE, District Court Judge,

10 Respondents,

11 and

12 REPUBLIC SILVER STATE DISPOSAL,
13 INC., ANDREW M. CASH, M.D.;
14 ANDREW M. CASH, M.D., P.C. aka
15 ANDREW MILLER CASH, M.D., P.C.;
16 DESERT INSTITUTE OF SPINE CARE,
17 LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company;
18 LAS VEGAS RADIOLOGY, LLC, a
19 Nevada Limited Liability Company;
20 BRUCE A. KATUNA, M.D.; ROCKY
21 MOUNTAIN NEURODIAGNOSTICS,
LLC, a Foreign Limited Liability Company;
DANIELLE MILLER aka DANIELLE
SHOPSHIRE; and NEUROMONITORING
ASSOCIATES,

 Real Parties in Interest.

Supreme Court Case No.:

Dist. Ct. Case No. EA 16-728183-0
Electronically Filed
Jan 13 2017 01:44 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

PETITION FOR WRIT OF
MANDAMUS

17 John H. Cotton, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 5268
18 Michael D. Navratil, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 7460
19 JOHN H. COTTON & ASSOCIATES
7900 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 200
20 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
T: (702) 832-5909 / F: (702) 832-5910
21 *Attorneys for Petitioners*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1

6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1

8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATEMENT OF CASE	3
A.	PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT AND ALLEGATIONS	3
II.	STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS.....	4
III.	PROCEDURAL HISTORY	6
IV.	ISSUE PRESENTED	7
V.	REASONS WHY THE COURT SHOULD HEAR ISSUE.....	7
VI.	REASONS WHY WRIT SHOULD ISSUE.....	8
A.	APPLICABLE LAW.....	9
B.	REPUBLIC DID NOT “EXTINGUISH THE LIABILITY” OF DR. BALODIMAS THROUGH ITS RELEASE AND THEREFORE, IS NOT ENTITLED TO CONTRIBUTION.	9
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Libby v. Dist. Ct.</i> , 325 P.3d. 1276, 130 Nev. Adv. Rep. 39 (2014)	7
<i>Medallion Development v. Converse Consultants</i> , 113 Nev. 27, 930 P.2d. 115 (1997)	8
<i>Oahu Ry & Land Co. v. United States</i> , 73 F.Supp. 707, 1947 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2160 (1947).....	11
<i>Saylor v. Arcotta</i> , 126 Nev. 92; 225 P.3d. 1276 (2010)	11
<i>Smith v. Dist. Ct.</i> , 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d. 849 (1991)	7
<i>TDC v. Vincent</i> , 120 Nev. 644, 98 P.3d. 681 (2004)	8

STATUTES

NRS 17.225	2, 9, 11
NRS 17.225(3)	2, 10
NRS 34.150	1
NRS 41A.097	11
NRS 41A.097(2)	10

OTHER AUTHORITIES

BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 326 (6 th Ed. 1991).....	8
------------------------------------------------------------	---

RULES

NRAP 21	1
---------------	---

1 **CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS**

2 Nevada Constitution, Art. 6, Sec. 41

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 **PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

2 Petitioners James D. Balodimas, M.D. and James D. Balodimas, M.D., P.C.,
3 hereby petition this Court to issue a writ of mandamus pursuant to NRS 34.150 et
4 seq., NRAP 21, and Article 6, Section 4 of the Nevada Constitution.

5 Petitioners request this Court for a Writ of Mandamus directing Respondent
6 District Court to GRANT Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings
7 regarding Real Party in Interest Republic Silver State Disposal, Inc's claim for
8 contribution against Dr. Balodimas and his corporation (joined by all other
9 Defendants to the case).

10 Petitioners are Defendants in a case entitled REPUBLIC SILVER STATE
11 DISPOSAL INC., v. ANDREW CASH, M.D., ET AL; Defendants; District Court
12 case number A-16-738123.

13 The Complaint in this matter was filed on June 27, 2016, by real parties in
14 interest Republic Silver State Disposal ("Republic"). Plaintiff alleges the
15 following causes of action against Defendants: 1) medical negligence; 2)
16 respondeat superior against various parties; 3) negligent supervision and retention;
17 and 4) contribution. The District Court properly dismissed the first three causes of
18 action, but denied the motion to dismiss the contribution claim.

19 Republic's claims all derive from care and treatment Dr. Balodimas (and the
20 other health care providers named as Defendants) provided to Maria Gonzales in
21 2012/2013. Republic alleges that the named Defendants exacerbated/caused

1 Ms. Gonzales to suffer injuries for which Republic alleges it was liable. (Republic
2 caused the initial accident which led to the treatment at issue in the case). The
3 treatment at issue in this case all took place before Ms. Gonzales filed her
4 complaint against Republic in the personal injury action.

5 In July of 2014, Republic entered into a settlement agreement to resolve Ms.
6 Gonzales's claims for \$2,000,000. Despite the fact that neither Ms. Gonzales nor
7 Republic named Dr. Balodimas (or the other health care Defendants) in the
8 underlying personal injury action, and the statute of limitations had already
9 extinguished any potential claim by Ms. Gonzales against Dr. Balodimas before
10 Republic entered into a settlement with Ms. Gonzales, Republic claims that it is
11 entitled to contribution from Dr. Balodimas and the other Defendants in this case
12 because it paid more than its share of liability for the damages in the case.

13 The District Court manifestly abused its discretion by failing to follow
14 NRS 17.225(3) which precludes a settling tortfeasor from making a contribution
15 claim unless it extinguishes the liability of the non-settling tortfeasor. There was
16 not even theoretical liability to extinguish at the time of the settlement because the
17 statute of limitations had run on Ms. Gonzales's claims against Dr. Balodimas long
18 before the settlement agreement was reached between Ms. Gonzales and Republic.
19 Accordingly, NRS 17.225(3) precludes Republic's claim for contribution in this
20 case as a matter of law.

1 A Writ of Mandamus is proper to compel the performance of acts by
2 Respondent from the office held by respondent. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, or
3 adequate remedy at law to compel the Respondent to perform its duty.
4 Furthermore, this is an important issue of law, and there are no facts in dispute in
5 this case.

6 **I. STATEMENT OF CASE**

7 **A. PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT AND ALLEGATIONS**

8 This is an alleged medical malpractice/contribution case. Real Party in
9 Interest/Plaintiff Republic Silver State Disposal, Inc. ("Republic") injured Maria
10 Gonzales when its truck driven by its employee crashed into her causing her to
11 require surgery on her back. After receiving treatment from several health care
12 providers, including James Balodimas ("Dr. Balodimas"), the patient filed suit
13 against Republic. Ms. Gonzales never named Dr. Balodimas (or any of her other
14 treating providers) as defendants in her lawsuit; nor did Republic add them as third
15 party defendants. Before trial, in the underlying case, Republic entered into a
16 settlement agreement with Ms. Gonzales for \$2,000,000.

17 In this action, Republic alleges that its settlement was too high and the
18 health care providers are responsible for a portion of these damages. Republic
19 alleged four causes of action against the health care providers: 1) medical
20 negligence; 2) respondeat superior against various parties; 3) negligent supervision
21 and retention; and 4) contribution. The District Court properly found that Republic

1 Services had no standing to assert the first three causes of action and properly
2 dismissed them.

3 For the contribution action, the District Court denied the Motion to
4 Dismiss/Motion for Judgment on the pleadings even though there was never a
5 common liability between Republic and the health care provider defendants, and
6 the statute of limitations for any claims by the patient had expired prior to Republic
7 and Ms. Gonzales entering into their settlement agreement. Therefore, Republic
8 could not have extinguished the liability for Dr. Balodimas or any of the other
9 medical defendants, as liability had already been extinguished as a matter of law
10 by the expiration of the statute of limitations.

11 **II. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS**

12 On January 14, 2012, a commercial garbage truck owned and operated by
13 Republic and driven by its employee Deval Hatcher caused injuries to patient
14 Marie Gonzalez, resulting in a legal action brought by Ms. Gonzalez against
15 Plaintiff for personal injuries related to Plaintiff's negligence. *See Appendix page*
16 *5, 9.*

17 On January 29, 2013, Ms. Gonzalez underwent surgery by Defendant Cash,
18 M.D. *See Appendix 5.*

19 On February 12, 2013 a CT study of Ms. Gonzalez's spine was performed at
20 Las Vegas Radiology. *See Appendix 7-8.*

1 Defendant Balodimas, M.D., is alleged to have interpreted the report and is
2 alleged to have failed to appreciate misplacement of pedicle screws placed by
3 Defendant Cash, M.D. *Id.*

4 On or about June 7 and July 12, 2013, Ms. Gonzalez consulted with Dr.
5 Jason Garber and Stuart Kaplan of Western Regional Center for Brain and Spine
6 Surgery for continuing debilitating post-surgical pain. Plaintiff alleges that Dr.
7 Garber and Kaplan opined that the pain was in the L5 and S1 nerve distributions
8 and that the pedicle screws on the left at L4-L5 and L5-S1 had breached the
9 pedicles. *See Appendix 8.*

10 On or about September 13, 2013, Ms. Gonzales filed her complaint against
11 Republic. *See Appendix 9.*

12 Republic alleges that Ms. Gonzalez required additional care and treatment
13 related to the placement of the pedicle screws by Defendant Cash, M.D. *See*
14 *Appendix 9-10.*

15 On July 6, 2015, Republic settled the case involving Ms. Gonzalez and her
16 alleged injuries resulting from Republic's negligence for \$2,000,000. *See*
17 *Appendix 9.*

18 The language in the release pertinent to these issues reads as follows:

19 As part of their settlement and their mutual consideration stated
20 above, this SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT; RELEASE and
21 COVENANT NOT TO SUE shall discharge and extinguish any and
all claims or liabilities, including those for "economic" and
"noneconomic" damages as set forth in NRS ch 41A, RELEASOR

1 may possess against any of her medical treatment providers for
2 injuries she alleges to have sustained in the described incident of
January 14, 2012.

3 *See Appendix 153.*

4 On June 27, 2016, Republic filed an amended complaint for medical
5 negligence and medical malpractice against various health care providers involved
6 in Ms. Gonzales' care. *See Appendix 1-42.*

7 **III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

8 On October 4, 2016, the parties appeared before the District Court to argue
9 Defendant Cash's Motion to Dismiss; Defendant Balodimas's Motion for
10 Judgment on the Pleadings, and Danielle Miller's Motion to Dismiss, and all
11 related joinders. The Court entertained oral argument and took the matter under
12 advisement. Later, the District Court issued a minute order setting an Evidentiary
13 Hearing for November 9, 2016. *See Appendix 121-122.* The Evidentiary hearing
14 was to address the following questions/issues:

15 1. Do the terms of the settlement agreement between Gonzales and
16 Republic extinguish the liability of the Defendants named in the present litigation?

17 2. If the statute of limitations set forth in NRS 41A.097 applies, is there
18 sufficient evidence to determine for purposes of the pending motions, when the
19 statute of limitations expired as it relates to each Defendant?

20 At the evidentiary hearing, Republic Services produced a copy of the release
21 agreement between the injured patient and itself. After Oral argument, the District

1 Court issued a Decision and Order on December 13, 2016 granting in part the
2 motions to dismiss (all claims except the contribution claims were dismissed). *See*
3 *Appendix 193-203*.

4 **IV. ISSUE PRESENTED**

5 Does a settling tortfeasor have a claim for contribution against a non-
6 party/non-settling defendant, where operation of law extinguishes the potential
7 liability between the underlying Plaintiff and the non-party Defendant, prior to the
8 settlement between the settling tortfeasor and the underlying Plaintiff?

9 **V. REASONS WHY THE COURT SHOULD HEAR ISSUE**

10 Whether to consider a writ of mandamus is within the court's discretion.
11 *Libby v. Dist. Ct.*, 325 P.3d. 1276, 130 Nev. Adv. Rep. 39 (2014)(citing *Smith v.*
12 *Dist. Ct.*, 107 Nev. 674, 818 P.2d. 849 (1991). As a general rule, the Nevada
13 Supreme Court will not exercise its discretion to challenge district court orders
14 denying summary judgment, but an exception applies when no disputed factual
15 issues exist and, pursuant to clear authority under a statute or a rule, the district
16 court is obliged to dismiss an action. *Id.*

17 In this case, there are no factual disputes and this is strictly an interpretation
18 of law. This is an important issue before the Court involving claims for
19 contribution against medical doctors alleged to have negligently exacerbated
20 injuries in personal injury cases. In this case, the District Court misinterpreted
21 Nevada law regarding contribution, as the legislature explicitly stated that a

1 settling tortfeasor does not have a claim for contribution unless the settling
2 tortfeasor extinguishes liability of the non-settling alleged tortfeasor.

3 Furthermore, there can be no question based upon the allegations contained
4 in Republic's Complaint that the statute of limitations for the patient's claim
5 against the Petitioners had run at the time she entered into the settlement with
6 Republic. Therefore, the settlement could not have extinguished a legally non-
7 existent liability of the Petitioners vis-à-vis the patient. The Court could use this
8 case as an opportunity to further clarify regarding application of these statutes to
9 contribution claims would be beneficial and would further justify the Court
10 entertaining this Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

11 **VI. REASONS WHY WRIT SHOULD ISSUE**

12 Contribution is defined as the right of one who had discharged a common
13 liability to recover of another also liable, the aliquot portion which he ought to pay
14 or bear. *Medallion Development v. Converse Consultants*, 113 Nev. 27, 930 P.2d.
15 115 (1997); *citing* BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 326 (6th Ed. 1991). Under the
16 principle of contribution, a tortfeasor against whom a judgment is rendered is
17 entitled to recover proportional shares of judgment from joint tortfeasors whose
18 negligence contributed to the injury and who are also liable to the plaintiff. *Id.*
19 (Citations omitted.) (Emphasis added.) Contribution is strictly a statutory remedy.
20 *TDC v. Vincent*, 120 Nev. 644, 98 P.3d. 681 (2004).

1 **A. APPLICABLE LAW**

2 The pertinent statute applicable to this issue is NRS 17.225. That statute
3 provides as follows:

4 Right to contribution.

5 1. Except as otherwise provided in this section and NRS 17.235 to
6 17.305, inclusive, *where two or more persons become jointly or*
7 *severally liable in tort for the same injury to person or property or*
8 *for the same wrongful death*, there is a right of contribution among
9 them even though judgment has not been recovered against all or any
10 of them.

11 2. The right of contribution exists only in favor of a tortfeasor who has
12 paid more than his or her equitable share of the common liability, and
13 the tortfeasor's total recovery is limited to the amount paid by the
14 tortfeasor in excess of his or her equitable share. No tortfeasor is
15 compelled to make contribution beyond his or her own equitable share
16 of the entire liability.

17 3. *A tortfeasor who enters into a settlement with a claimant is not*
18 *entitled to recover contribution from another tortfeasor whose*
19 *liability for the injury or wrongful death is not extinguished by the*
20 *settlement nor in respect to any amount paid in a settlement which is*
21 *in excess of what was reasonable.*

(Emphasis added).

16 **B. REPUBLIC DID NOT "EXTINGUISH THE LIABILITY" OF**
17 **DR. BALODIMAS THROUGH ITS RELEASE AND**
18 **THEREFORE, IS NOT ENTITLED TO CONTRIBUTION.**

19 *A tortfeasor who enters into a settlement with a claimant is not entitled to*
20 *recover contribution from another tortfeasor whose liability for the injury or*
21 *wrongful death is not extinguished by the settlement nor in respect to any*
 amount paid in a settlement which is in excess of what was reasonable. NRS

1 17.225(3). In other words, unless the settling tortfeasor extinguishes the liability
2 of the non-settling alleged tortfeasor by the settlement agreement, there is no
3 claim for contribution.

4 In this case, operation of law extinguished any of the patient's claims against
5 the Defendants prior to the settlement between Republic and Ms. Gonzales.
6 Petitioners' liability was not extinguished by the settlement between Republic
7 Services and the underlying Plaintiff. The statute of limitations had run on any
8 potential claim that Ms. Gonzalez brought against Defendants by the time the
9 Plaintiff entered into its release agreement with her. On the face of the Complaint,
10 Ms. Gonzalez had knowledge of a potential claim of malpractice by July 12, 2013
11 when Dr. Garber and Dr. Kaplan discovered the alleged misplacement of the
12 screws. Therefore, the statute of limitations on Ms. Gonzalez's claims against the
13 Defendants would have run on July 12, 2014. *See* NRS 41A.097(2).

14 Republic did not attempt to secure the release of any potential claims against
15 the health care Defendants until **July 6, 2015**, more than one year after the statute
16 of limitations had run on Ms. Gonzalez's potential claims for malpractice.
17 Therefore, Republic could not have "extinguished" even Defendants' theoretical
18 liability through the release because liability had already been extinguished by law
19 and the expiration of the statute of limitations. Therefore, because there was no
20 "common liability" either in fact or even theoretically at the time Plaintiff settled
21 with Ms. Gonzalez, there can be no contribution claim against the Defendants.

1 There can be no contribution where the injured person has no right of action
2 against the third-party defendant. The right of contribution is a derivative right and
3 not a new cause of action. *Oahu Ry & Land Co. v. United States*, 73 F.Supp. 707,
4 1947 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2160 (1947). This is consistent with the legislature's
5 requirement that a settling tortfeasor seeking contribution from a non-settling
6 defendant extinguish the liability of the non-settling defendant. If there is nothing
7 to extinguish, because there is no viable claim, there can be no contribution from a
8 settling tortfeasor pursuant to NRS 17.225.

9 **VII. CONCLUSION**

10 In this case, there are two facts that prohibit a contribution action by
11 Republic against Dr. Balodimas: *(1) Dr. Balodimas was NOT liable in tort to the*
12 *patient Maria Gonzalez at the time of the release (and in fact, never was); and*
13 *(2) Republic Services did not "extinguish" liability for Dr. Balodimas as part of*
14 *its settlement with Ms. Gonzalez because it had already been extinguished prior*
15 *to the settlement.*¹

16
17 ¹ Petitioners believe that this is an "an action for injury or death against a health
18 care provider" and subject to NRS 41A.097, notwithstanding this Court's decision
19 in *Saylor v. Arcotta*, 126 Nev. 92; 225 P.3d. 1276 (2010). However, the fact that
20 Republic did not extinguish any claim by the patient against Dr. Balodimas is
21 dispositive of the case and warrants dismissal without addressing that issue.
Petitioners reserve all rights to ask the Court to revisit the statute of limitations
issue addressed in *Saylor*, as Petitioners believe that allowing a contribution claim
to proceed in violation of NRS 41A.097 undermines the clear legislative purpose
behind NRS 41A.097.

1 Nevada law is certainly clear that a settling tortfeasor does not have a
2 contribution claim if it does not extinguish the liability of the non-settling alleged
3 tortfeasors. Therefore, there is no basis under Nevada law for Republic to have a
4 contribution claim in this case.

5 Dated this 13th day of January 2017.

6 JOHN H. COTTON & ASSOCIATES

7
8 By: /s/Michael D. Navratil
9 John H. Cotton, Esq.
10 Nevada Bar No. 5268
11 Michael D. Navratil, Esq.
12 Nevada Bar No. 7460
13 7900 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 200
14 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
15 Attorneys for Petitioners
16
17
18
19
20
21

1 **DECLARATION OF MICHAEL D. NAVRATIL, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF**
2 **PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

3 Michael D. Navratil, Esq., declares as follows:

4 I am an attorney with the law firm of John H. Cotton & Associates, and
5 attorney of record for Petitioners, James D. Balodimas, M.D. and James D.
6 Balodimas, M.D., P.C., in the above-captioned case. I have personal knowledge of
7 the matters stated in this declaration, except for those stated upon information and
8 belief. To those matters stated upon information and belief, I believe them to be
9 true. I am competent to testify as to the facts stated herein in a court of law and
10 will do so if called upon.

11 This declaration is made by the undersigned attorney pursuant to
12 NRS 15.010, on the ground that the matters stated and relied upon in the foregoing
13 Petition are all contained in the prior pleadings and other records of the district
14 court, true and correct copies of which have been attached hereto.

15 I certify and affirm that the Petition is filed in good faith, and that the
16 Petitioners have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of
17 law that the Petitioners could pursue in absence of the extraordinary relief
18 requested.

19 Dated this 13th day of January 2017.

20 /s/Michael D. Navratil
21 Michael D. Navratil, Esq.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Q

0

○

4

2

—

1

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1

6

7
8

901

- 2
- 3
- 4

5
6
7

8
9
10

1 James Olsen, Esq.
2 OLSEN, CANNON, ET. AL.
3 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
Attorney for Bruce Katuna, M.D. and Rocky Mountain Neurodiagnostics, LLC

4 James Murphy, Esq.
5 LAXALT & NOMURA, LTD.
6 6720 Via Austi Parkway, Suite 430
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Attorney for Neuromonitoring Associates

7 The Honorable Jerry Wiese
8 Clark County, State of Nevada
200 Lewis Avenue
9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Respondent

10
11 /s/Katie Johnson
An employee of John H. Cotton & Associates

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B

REGISTER OF ACTIONS

CASE No. A-16-738123-C

Republic Silver State Disposal, Inc., Plaintiff(s) vs. Andrew Cash,
M.D., Defendant(s)

§
§
§
§
§
§

Case Type: **Malpractice - Medical/Dental**
Date Filed: **06/08/2016**
Location: **Department 30**
Cross-Reference Case Number: **A738123**

PARTY INFORMATION

Defendant	Andrew M Cash M.D P.C Also Known As Cash M.D P.C, Andrew Miller	Lead Attorneys Robert C. McBride <i>Retained</i> 702-792-5855(W)
Defendant	Balodimas, James D, M.D.	John H Cotton <i>Retained</i> 702-832-5909(W)
Defendant	Cash, M.D., Andrew M.	Robert C. McBride <i>Retained</i> 702-792-5855(W)
Defendant	Desert Institute of Spine Care LLC	Robert C. McBride <i>Retained</i> 702-792-5855(W)
Defendant	James D Balodimas M.D P.C	John H Cotton <i>Retained</i> 702-832-5909(W)
Defendant	Katuna, Bruce A, M.D.	James R. Olson <i>Retained</i> 7023844012(W)
Defendant	Las Vegas Radiology LLC	Kim Irene Mandelbaum <i>Retained</i> 7023671234(W)
Defendant	Miller, Danielle Also Known As Shopshire, Danielle	Anthony D Lauria <i>Retained</i> 702-387-8633(W)
Defendant	Neuromonitoring Associates	James E. Murphy <i>Retained</i> 7023881551(W)
Defendant	Rocky Mountain Neurodiagnostics LLC	James R. Olson <i>Retained</i> 7023844012(W)
Plaintiff	Republic Silver State Disposal, Inc.	David Leslie Barron <i>Retained</i> 7028703940(W)

EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT

04/18/2017 | **All Pending Motions** (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer Wiese, Jerry A.)

Minutes

04/18/2017 9:00 AM

- Following further arguments of counsel regarding Supreme Court.

COURT ORDERED, MOTIONS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

5/4/2017

<https://www.clarkcountycourts.us/Anonymous/CaseDetail.aspx?CaseID=11691616&HearingID=192703527&SingleViewMode=Minutes>

The Court will wait to see what the Supreme Court wants to do. Mr. Barton to prepare the Order.

Parties Present

[Return to Register of Actions](#)