

- 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

Electronically Filed
S.C. No. 20-27817 09:11 a.m.
D.C. No. A-17-750171-C
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Respondent.

1 As a practical matter, this court has occasionally consolidated appeals growing out
2 of the same fact pattern or involving common issues of law.¹

3 Now pending before this Court are three appeals all growing out of the same
4 facts and circumstances. The cast of characters involved in the appeals – as parties
5 and as counsel – are the same. The issues involve the same events and fact pattern;
6 the resolution of one of these appeals will necessarily affect or determine the others.
7 The facts and law involved between the three cases are so closely aligned that it
8 makes good judicial sense to consolidate the appeals.

9 All three cases grow out of the facts of the *Saiter* appeal (No. 72819), in which
10 attorney Jennifer Abrams (“Attorney Abrams”) represented the husband, and attorney
11 Louis Schneider (“Attorney Schneider”) represented the wife.

12 The Abrams firm documented assorted improprieties by Attorney Schneider in
13 a *Motion for Sanctions and Attorney’s Fees* (“Sanctions Motion”) alleging that he
14 was responsible for delaying the resolution of the case and fueling unnecessary
15 litigation for his own personal and improper motives, including billing and discovery
16 improprieties, claiming to continue representing his client after being fired,
17 obstructing resolution of the case against her wishes, and other inappropriate behavior
18 including “sexually suggestive conduct” toward his client.²

19 Attorney Schneider responded with a written threat that if the motion was not
20 withdrawn he would oppose it “and take additional action beyond the opposition.”
21

22
23 ¹ See, e.g., *Mack-Manley v. Manley*, 122 Nev. 849, 138 P.3d 525 (2006); *A*
24 *Minor v. Juvenile Div. of Seventh Judicial Dist. Court*, 97 Nev. 281, 630 P.2d 245
25 (1981); *Huckabay v. NC Auto Parts, LLC*, 130 Nev. ___, ___ P.3d ___ (Adv. Opn.
26 23, Mar. 27, 2014); *Gilman v. Gilman*, 114 Nev. 416, 956 P.2d 761 (1998).

27 ² All citations to the record in the *Saiter* matter are set out in the *Opening Brief*
28 now on file in that case.

1 When the Abrams firm did not withdraw the Sanctions Motion, Attorney
2 Schneider followed through on his threat by requesting a copy of the video of a
3 closed hearing in the case, and providing it to Steve Sanson of "Veterans In Politics
4 International, Inc." ("Sanson") to post along with commentary attacking the integrity
5 of Attorney Abrams and her law firm.³

6 Sanson claims to run an "advocacy" group but actually runs an internet-based
7 extortion and defamation service intended to alter political races and judicial
8 proceedings – essentially a modern day "protection racket."⁴

9 Attorney Schneider's client, Tina, did not want videos from her divorce posted
10 on the internet; when she questioned him about it, Attorney Schneider sent her email
11 pretending that he did not know how it got posted, which she then copied to her
12 husband, Brandon.

13 Judge Elliott never stated where, or from whom, she got the out-of-court false
14 assertions about the ethics of the Abrams firm, although a later statement from Judge
15 Duckworth (detailed below) suggests the source. In addition to withdrawing her
16 remarks by the end of the hearing in question, Judge Elliott sent a note days later
17 telling Attorney Abrams that "I think you are one of the most ethical attorneys that
18 I know!"

19 By about October 3, Sanson posted the video of the closed *Saiter* hearing video
20 on Youtube and a link to the video was emailed to thousands of third parties not
21

22 ³ The Sanson commentary invited viewers to watch that portion of the video
23 where Judge Elliott made unfounded accusations against the ethics of the Abrams
24 firm, but did not mention the judge's retraction of those comments an hour later after
25 learning the facts.

26 ⁴ Sanson effectively advertises it as such, having posted that he and his
27 organization are available: "When people needed someone [*sic*] to get dirty so they can
28 stay nameless, we do it without hesitation."

1 involved in the case. An advertisement for Attorney Schneider's law office then
2 appeared as an advertisement on Sanson's Facebook page.

3 Sanson initiated a series of "smear campaigns" against Attorney Abrams via
4 email blast, Youtube, numerous Facebook pages, Twitter accounts, Google+
5 accounts, and on various blogs and Facebook "groups," etc., re-posting the embedded
6 *Saiter* hearing video again and again thereafter. While Sanson has publicly admitted
7 that there was some payment from Schneider at the time, it is unknown how much
8 Sanson was paid for these "services."

9 Attorney Abrams filed suit against Attorney Schneider and Sanson based on
10 Schneider's use of Sanson to try to improperly influence the court and extort
11 concessions in the *Saiter* divorce, and sought an injunction against the ongoing
12 defamation.

13 That action, No. 73838 (the "Abrams appeal"), is one of the appeals sought to
14 be consolidated here. During preliminary motion hearings, Judge Leavitt – before
15 permitting any discovery into Schneider's payments to Sanson or the scheme between
16 Attorney Schneider and Sanson to improperly influence the divorce court and to
17 extort concessions in the *Saiter* case, dismissed the suit under the "anti-SLAPP"
18 statutes, finding that the postings against Attorney Abrams were insufficiently
19 defamatory to proceed. As of this writing, that case is in the appellate settlement
20 program.

21 When Sanson discovered the personal relationship between Attorney Abrams
22 and undersigned counsel ("Attorney Willick") and became acquainted with another
23 divorce litigant seeking to improperly influence a judge in an ongoing case (Doug
24 Ansell, discussed below), he expanded the smear campaigns to include Attorney
25 Willick, falsely accusing him of multiple crimes and other wrongs. This led to a
26
27
28

1 separate defamation complaint against Sanson, also seeking damages and injunctive
2 relief.

3 That action, No. 72778 (the “Sanson Appeal”), is the third appeal sought to be
4 consolidated. During preliminary motion hearings, Judge Thompson denied Sanson’s
5 “anti-SLAPP” motion and Sanson appealed the denial. Sanson has filed his opening
6 brief in that appeal.

7 Sanson’s brief includes a large amount of material referencing matters outside
8 the record of that case. While normally objectionable, in this very specific situation,
9 we not only do not oppose the reference, but urge the Court to consider it, at least for
10 purposes of this consolidation motion.⁵

11 On pages 13-14 of his opening brief, Sanson makes extended reference to the
12 ongoing divorce case of *Ansell v. Ansell*.⁶

13 On August 30, 2017, the Hon. Bryce Duckworth recused from that case,
14 making an extended record that the reason he was doing so is that he was contacted
15 by Sanson, outside of court, in an effort “*to influence and intimidate the Court*
16 *through a corrupt communication outside of court.*”⁷ (Emphasis in original.) When
17 rebuked, Sanson made “a veiled threat” against Judge Duckworth,⁸ leading the judge
18 to note that the “sole motivation” for Sanson’s contact was to “intimidate and harass
19 the Court,” and noting that Sanson and his organization are “an individual and group
20

21 ⁵ The Court can choose to take judicial notice of facts generally known or
22 capable of verification from a reliable source under NRS 47.150(1). *Mack v. Estate*
23 *of Mack*, 125 Nev. 80, 206 P.3d 98 (2009). The court record in the *Ansell* case is such
24 a reliable source.

25 ⁶ Case No. D-15-521960-D.

26 ⁷ See Exhibit A, *Order of Recusal* filed September 5, 2017, at 5.

27 ⁸ *Id.* at 6.

1 who seek to manipulate, intimidate and control,” adding that the *Ansell* case “has
2 exposed the reality of his tactics.”⁹

3 Asking rhetorically “*Is there anything more corrupt than the influence Mr.*
4 *Sanson sought to exert over the Court?*”¹⁰ Judge Duckworth made it clear that he lay
5 Sanson’s intended interference in that case at the feet of Doug Ansell, who had met
6 with Sanson prior to his attempted interference.¹¹

7 Those revelations give some insight into the probable source of the false
8 assertions about Attorney Abrams that were fed to Judge Elliott in the *Saiter* matter,
9 and bear directly on the requested consolidation because of the inter-relation of the
10 facts and persons in the three appeals.

11 In the Saiter Appeal, recognition of the online defamation and extortion
12 campaigns by Sanson as detailed in the Abrams Appeal and the Sanson Appeal bear
13 on this Court’s determination of why this Court should verify the authority of district
14 court judges to prohibit the dissemination of the videos of closed hearings in sealed
15 files. On remand, inquiry can be made as to Sanson’s direct out-of-court
16 communications to Judge Elliott beyond the several such communications that are
17 already in the record.

18 In the Abrams Appeal, knowledge of Attorney Schneider’s covert providing
19 of the closed hearing video to Sanson bears directly on the propriety of Judge
20 Leavitt’s dismissal of Abrams’ suit without even permitting discovery into what
21 money Schneider paid Sanson as part of their conspiracy to extort action in the *Saiter*
22 case by way of out-of-court pressure tactics against counsel. A review of the smear
23

24 ⁹ *Id.* at 7.

25 ¹⁰ *Id.* at 9 (emphasis in original).

26 ¹¹ *Id.*

1 campaigns at issue in that case is informed by the show cause proceedings in the
2 *Saiter* case that Schneider was trying to derail.

3 Both the Abrams Appeal and the Sanson Appeal are directly concerned with
4 Nevada's "anti-SLAPP" statutes, and the present posture is that one such motion was
5 granted while the other one was denied; any clarification of the standards to be
6 applied to such decisions necessarily affects both cases, and they should be
7 consolidated for judicial economy and to reduce the possibility of inconsistent
8 decisions and guidance.

9 In the Sanson Appeal, the record of the underlying *Saiter* litigation, and the
10 Abrams Appeal, bear directly on the appeal of Judge Thompson's denial of Sanson's
11 motion to dismiss, which was made in the context of a defamation campaign against
12 Attorney Willick by Sanson as part of Sanson's efforts to pressure Attorney Abrams
13 in *Saiter*.

14 As to the parties, Sanson is directly involved in all three appeals as the agitator
15 attempting to influence ongoing litigation by running online defamation campaigns
16 against lawyers and threatening judges. Attorney Schneider is trial counsel for the
17 wife in *Saiter* and a defendant in the Abrams appeal.

18 Attorney Abrams is trial counsel for the husband in *Saiter*, the plaintiff in the
19 Abrams appeal, as well as counsel of record for plaintiff and the original target in the
20 defamation campaign at issue in the Sanson Appeal. Attorney Willick is trial counsel
21 for plaintiff in the Abrams appeal, the plaintiff in the Sanson Appeal, and appellate
22 counsel for the husband in the *Saiter* Appeal.


23 The records in these three cases largely overlap, and as Sanson's opening brief
24 shows, it is virtually impossible to present any of them without extensive references
25 to the others.

1 The decisions in all of these actions, and any money damages resulting from
2 any of them, will necessarily impact all of the parties to all three cases. As a matter
3 of judicial economy, consolidation should reduce the number of papers submitted to
4 this Court, and, ultimately, reduce the collective cost of litigation in these cases.

5 **WHEREFORE**, Appellant requests that this Court issue an order providing
6 for the consolidation of the above-referenced appeals, and setting a new briefing
7 schedule.

8 **DATED** this 28th day of September, 2017.

9 WILLYCK LAW GROUP

10 
11 _____


12 MARSHAL S. WILLYCK, ESQ.

13 Nevada Bar No. 002515
14 3551 E. Bonanza, Suite 101
15 Las Vegas, Nevada 89110
16 (702) 438-4100
17 Attorneys for Appellant
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of the WILICK LAW GROUP, and that on this 28th day of September, 2017, served a true and correct copy of the foregoing *Motion to Consolidate Appeals*, was delivered by runner delivery service and by placing the same in a sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service at Las Vegas, Nevada, with first-class postage prepaid, and addressed as follows:

Anat Levy, Esq.
Anat Levy and Associates, P.C.
5841E. Charleston Blvd., #230-421
Las Vegas, Nevada 89142
alevy96@aol.com
Attorney for Appellants



An Employee of the WILICK LAW GROUP

\\wlgserver\company\wp16\SANSON,SIDRAFTS\00201161.WPD/fj

EXHIBIT “A”

EXHIBIT “A”

EXHIBIT “A”



1
2 ORDR
3
4

5 DISTRICT COURT
6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

7 IRINA ANSELL,)

8 Plaintiff,)

9 v.)

CASE NO. D-15-521960-D

DEPT NO. Q

10 DOUGLAS ANSELL,)

11 Defendant.)

Date of Hearing: August 30, 2017

Time of Hearing: 2:00 p.m.

12
13
14 ORDER OF RECUSAL

15 This matter came on for a hearing before this Court on August 30, 2017. The
16 matters before the Court included:

- 17
- 18 (1) Non-Party, Veterans In Politics International, Inc. and Steve Sanson's
19 Motion to Quash Subpoena Served on Verizon Wireless (Jul.26, 2017);
 - 20 (2) Non-Parties Steve Sanson, Veterans In Politics International, Inc., and
21 Sanson Corporation's Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum and
22 Deposition Subpoena Served on Steve Sanson on July 22, 2017 (Aug. 4,
23 2017); and
 - 24 (3) This Court's Amended Notice of Rescheduling of Hearing and Setting
25 Calendar Call (Aug. 28, 2017).

26 Associated motions and papers were considered and reviewed by the Court,
27 including requests for attorney's fees and Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (Aug. 10,
28 2017). The discovery issues previously were assigned to be heard by the Discovery
Commissioner on August 20, 2017. The Discovery Commissioner, however, recused

BRYCE C. DUCKWORTH
DISTRICT JUDGE

FAMILY DIVISION, DEPT. Q
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101

1
2 and the matter was placed on this Court's calendar on the above-referenced date.
3 Plaintiff did not appear personally, but was represented by her attorney, Marshal
4 Willick, Esq. Defendant did not appear personally, but was represented by his
5 attorney, John Jones, Esq. Steve Sanson appeared personally and with his attorney,
6 Anat Levy, Esq.
7

8 As previously noted, this Court reviewed a multitude of papers filed by and on
9 behalf of Plaintiff and Mr. Sanson or Veterans In Politics International (hereinafter
10 referred to individually and collectively as "Mr. Sanson") in preparation for the hearing.
11 This Court's preparation included review of the Omnibus Supplemental Declaration
12 of Steve Sanson in Support of: Motions to Quash Subpoenas Duces Tecum Served on
13 Verizon Wireless and Steve Sanson and Deposition Subpoena Served on Steve on July
14 22, 2017; Motion for Attorneys Fees (Aug. 22, 2017) (hereinafter referred to as Mr.
15 Sanson's "Sworn Declaration"). Therein, Mr. Sanson described his off-the-record
16 communications with this Court about this matter. Upon reviewing Mr. Sanson's
17 Sworn Declaration, this Court determined that it should recuse from any further
18 proceedings in this matter. This determination is based on the findings stated on the
19 record at the August 30, 2017 hearing and additional findings stated herein.
20
21

22 It is undisputed that Defendant designated Mr. Sanson as a witness. Moreover,
23 although Mr. Jones argued it was unlikely, Defendant could not definitively rule out
24 the possibility that Mr. Sanson might be called as a witness in future proceedings. It
25 also is undisputed that Mr. Sanson made specific reference to this case in a
26 communication directed at this Court off the record. In fact, this Court scheduled an
27
28

1
2 immediate hearing in May 2017 to address Mr. Sanson's ex-parte communication with
3 the Court.¹ Mr. Sanson's filing of his Sworn Declaration, however, was the first
4 instance in which this Court became aware that Mr. Sanson had stated in writing the
5 nature of his communications with the Court.
6

7 This Court noted that it was unaware of any legal authority that would excuse
8 someone from a deposition who had been designated as a witness in the matter. This
9 Court also noted its concern that the Subpoena Duces Tecum served on Mr. Sanson
10 was overbroad and should be narrowed significantly. Because, however, this Court
11 recognized the conflict created by Mr. Sanson's Sworn Declaration, the Court did not
12 rule on the discovery motions and determined that the Court's recusal from this matter
13 was appropriate.
14
15

16 In Mr. Sanson's Sworn Declaration, he acknowledged that he asked the
17 Court off the record: "Why do you allow Marshal Willick to get away with so much
18
19 ...
20 ...
21 ...
22 ...
23

24
25 ¹At the May 17, 2017 hearing, this Court disclosed Mr. Sanson's communications with
26 the Court. This Court also noted for the record the nature of the Court's relationship with Mr.
27 Sanson in the past. This has included this Court's endorsement by Veterans in Politics as a
28 candidate for office and his prior professional communications about general issues (including
Mr. Sanson repeatedly stating that he believed this Court should serve as the presiding judge
in the Family Division). At the time of the May 2017 communication, Mr. Sanson was aware
that litigation before the Court should never be discussed. Thus, any communication about
a specific case was completely unexpected.

1
2 crap in Doug Ansell's case?"² For sake of completeness, the text messages and
3 telephone communication between Mr. Sanson and the Court took place as follows:

- 4 ● On May 11, 2017 at 8:20 p.m., Mr. Sanson texted: "Judge I need to
5 speak to you."
- 6 ● On May 12, 2017 at 6:52 a.m., the Court texted Mr. Sanson: "What do
7 you need to talk about?"
- 8 ● On May 12, 2017 at 9:29 a.m., Mr. Sanson responded with: "Call me at
9 your convenience or we can grab a cup of tea."
- 10 ● The Court called Mr. Sanson on May 13, 2017. After prefatory remarks
11 that included Mr. Sanson declaring that this Court should be the
12 presiding judge in the family division, Mr. Sanson, without prompting,
13 asked: "Why do you allow Marshal Willick to get away with so much
14 "crap" in Doug Ansell's case?"

15 ²On a number of occasions, this Court has lamented that *both* parties have engaged in,
16 to borrow Mr. Sanson's term, "crap" during this case. This Court repeatedly has chastised both
17 sides for their practice of hyperbole and exaggeration. Mr. Willick has almost incessantly
18 argued that this Court has allowed Defendant (Mr. Ansell) to get away with "crap" without
19 repercussion. Both Mr. Willick and Mr. Jones are adept at selectively handpicking those areas
20 of perceived wrongdoing of the other side and advocating through their myopic lenses. On Mr.
21 Jones' part, this was exemplified during the August 30, 2017 hearing through his argument that
22 the Court had given Plaintiff a "free pass" with respect to her alleged violation of the Order to
23 Seal Records (Oct. 16, 2015) (hereinafter referred to as the "Sealing Order"). The Sealing
24 Order *drafted and submitted by Defendant (Mr. Ansell)*, ordered that "all papers, records,
25 proceedings and evidence, including exhibits and transcripts of testimony in the above-entitled
26 matter, be, and the same hereby are, sealed and shall not be opened to inspection *except by the*
27 *parties* and their attorneys, or when required as evidence in another action or proceeding."
28 (Emphasis added). Mr. Jones' argument in Court notwithstanding, this matter was adjudicated
by the Court. See Order (Aug. 30, 2016). Thus, the Sealing Order *drafted and submitted by*
Defendant (Mr. Ansell), did not prohibit the conduct about which Defendant complained. NRS
125.110 provides that the papers sealed "shall not be open to inspection except *to* the parties
and their attorneys." The Sealing Order *prepared by Defendant* changed the statutory language
and provided that the papers sealed "shall not be opened to inspection except *by* the parties
and their attorneys." Recognizing the error of his own drafting, Defendant (Mr. Ansell)
submitted a second Order to Seal Records (Nov. 23, 2016). Mr. Jones knew these facts when
he lambasted the Court during the August 30, 2017 hearing for purportedly allowing Plaintiff
to violate a Sealing Order that did not proscribe the alleged conduct. Apart from these
examples of "crap," the Court has endured "crap" from *both* parties throughout this litigation.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- After immediately terminating the call, this Court texted Mr. Sanson as follows: "Please do not ever talk to me again about a pending case before me. I hold you in higher esteem than that. I'm sorry to end the call so abruptly. My integrity means too much to me than to be influenced by others outside of the courtroom and it shakes the very core of our system when anyone communicates with a judicial officer in this fashion. It simply cannot happen. I know that you know that and I have always trusted your judgment in that regard."
 - Mr. Sanson's immediate text response reads: "You asked me a question because of our relationship I gave you my honest answer, so you can understand what direction we are headed."

10 This Court scheduled a hearing immediately (heard on May 17, 2017) to
11 disclose the improper communication. Based on Mr. Sanson's testimony on August
12 30, 2017, he admitted that his communication with the Court was not intended to
13 relay specific factual information about the Ansell case. When offered the opportunity
14 to provide specific examples of "crap" perpetrated by Mr. Willick (such as a
15 miscalculation by Mr. Willick, a fabricated fact, or some other specific example of
16 "crap"), Mr. Sanson had nothing specific. As such, *the only purpose of his*
17 *communication with the Court was to influence and intimidate the Court through a*
18 *corrupt communication outside of court.*

19 Mr. Sanson could have limited his communication with the Court to a *general*
20 accusation that Mr. Willick "gets away with crap," and left it at that.³ If Mr. Sanson's
21 sole motivation was merely to attack Mr. Willick *in general* and not to influence the
22

23

24

25

26

27

28

³Based on the papers filed herein, this Court is aware that litigation is pending between Mr. Willick and Mr. Sanson. This Court's familiarity with this civil matter is limited to the disclosures contained in the papers filed in the Ansell matter. The animosity resulting from this civil litigation is palpable. Nevertheless, this animosity is not an excuse to attempt to manipulate and intimidate this Court – *particularly in regards to a specific case.*

1
2 Court about a specific case, he could have done so. Although such communication
3 remains improper, it is more egregious that Mr. Sanson *knowingly and intentionally*
4 *identified Doug Ansell's case*. It also is significant that Mr. Sanson's response was not
5 to offer an apology, or to assure the Court that he would refrain from doing so again.
6 Even at the August 30, 2017 hearing, Mr. Sanson remained unapologetic. In fact, his
7 demeanor and conduct was defiant, even lashing out at Mr. Willick to the point of
8 being admonished by the Court. Instead of apologizing to the Court, his follow-up
9 communication was a veiled threat to the Court. This threat by Mr. Sanson, as stated
10 by Mr. Sanson and interpreted by the Court, was to harass the Court and to hurl
11 baseless and defamatory accusations about the Court.
12

13
14 Mr. Sanson argues that his organization "exposes public corruption and
15 injustices." Further, despite the fact that Mr. Ansell designated Mr. Sanson as *his*
16 witness, Mr. Sanson states with emphasis that neither he nor VIPI "*have anything to do*
17 *with this case*." To reiterate for the record, Mr. Sanson intentionally interjected himself
18 into this matter by communicating with the Court in reference to this specific case.
19 Plaintiff understandably and justifiably has sought to determine the full extent of such
20 off-the-record communications. To be clear, however, Mr. Sanson's involvement in this
21 matter is not about exposing "injustice" or corruption. Mr. Sanson acknowledged that
22 he had never met Plaintiff and proclaimed that he meant her no "ill will." Indeed, Mr.
23 Sanson appeared to be unaware that Defendant (Doug Ansell) was the prevailing party
24 with respect to the child custody issues in this case – an issue that is of the highest
25 significance in *most* cases.
26
27
28

1
2 As noted previously, when given the opportunity at the August 30, 2017 hearing
3 to explain the "crap" that was occurring in the Ansell matter, Mr. Sanson was unable
4 to identify any singular fact. As such, notwithstanding his self-proclaimed faux cover
5 of seeking to "expose injustice and corruption," Mr. Sanson's sole motivation for
6 communicating with this Court was to intimidate and harass the Court. Mr. Sanson
7 proudly proclaims that he has "declared war" on the Family Court. There is no doubt
8 that the courts are under attack and that the entire judiciary of this great State of
9 Nevada is on notice that, behind that false banner of "justice and corruption" is an
10 individual and group who seek to manipulate, intimidate and control. The arsenal of
11 weapons that Mr. Sanson utilizes include attempts to manipulate, intimidate and
12 control the judicial process through off-the-record communications. This case has
13 exposed the reality of his tactics.

14
15
16
17 Rather than apologize for his unethical and corrupt conduct, *Mr. Sanson has the*
18 *audacity to blame this Court for his improper communication.* Specifically, Mr. Sanson
19 alleges under oath in his Sworn Declaration that his off-the-record *question* to the Court
20 was somehow an answer to a same-day related conversation. The timing of this entire
21 narrative offered by Mr. Sanson is significant as it belies Mr. Sanson's story. Mr.
22 Sanson alleges in his Sworn Declaration that his originating text message took place on
23 the *same day* as a conversation with the Court in the courtroom (i.e., May 11, 2017).
24 To this end, Mr. Sanson's narrative suggests that his text message was intended merely
25 to follow-up on a conversation earlier that same day. Mr. Sanson's narrative, however,
26 is a *factual impossibility*. In this regard, May 11, 2017 was this Court's Chamber
27
28

1
2 Calendar day. No hearings were scheduled in Department Q on May 11, 2017. There
3 was no conversation on May 11, 2017 as Mr. Sanson has alleged.⁴ Regardless, even if
4 Mr. Sanson's sworn recitation of facts is believed, his communication with the Court
5 *remains improper.*
6

7 What should be frightening to this Court (and members of the Nevada judiciary
8 in general), is that Mr. Sanson refused to acknowledge at the August 30, 2017 hearing
9 that his communication with the Court about a pending case was inappropriate.
10 Specifically, Mr. Sanson, through his counsel, suggested it was the Court's fault based
11 on the earlier conversation cited above. This Court reiterates that it is inappropriate
12 to communicate with a judicial officer off the record about a pending case – *at any*
13 *time and under any circumstances.* Mr. Sanson's attempts to deflect blame to the
14 Court are appalling.
15

16 This Court's abrupt termination of the telephone call and immediate text to Mr.
17 Sanson that his communication was inappropriate was not Mr. Sanson's desired
18 response or reaction from the Court. It is now obvious that Mr. Sanson was looking
19 for a response from the Court more along the lines of: "I'm so sorry Mr. Sanson, I'll
20 make sure that Mr. Willick doesn't get his way," or, "I'm so sorry Mr. Sanson, I'll make
21 sure Mr. Ansell comes out on top," or even, "message received Mr. Sanson." *Is there*
22
23
24
25

26
27 "This is not simply a matter of "oops, I got the date wrong." Any change to the date
28 changes the entire narrative and creates a logical disconnection in time. This Court's staff
checked the videotape of the hearings in all cases held in Department Q on the preceding
Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of that same week and was unable to find Mr. Sanson in
the gallery at the beginning or conclusion of any case.

1
2 *anything more corrupt than the influence Mr. Sanson sought to exert over the Court?*

3 And he proclaims that he seeks to expose corruption? Because this Court called him
4 out on the inappropriateness of his communication and refused to kowtow and cower
5 to his manipulation and control, Mr. Sanson predictably let the Court know that his
6 wrath was coming out against the Court. This type of threat to any judicial officer
7 strikes at the very core of the integrity of the judicial process. Moreover, such
8 threatening behavior is an attempt to manipulate and control judicial officers if they
9 do not succumb to Mr. Sanson's desired result.
10
11

12 Mr. Jones argued that there is no evidence that Defendant had anything to do
13 with Mr. Sanson's communication with the Court or that he put Mr. Sanson "up to it."
14 Mr. Jones is correct that there was no testimony offered that indicates that Defendant
15 is responsible for Mr. Sanson's behavior. Defendant did not appear at the hearing to
16 offer his version of events. Although this Court is unable to attribute Mr. Sanson's
17 actions to Defendant directly, this Court notes that Mr. Sanson's communication with
18 the Court was not the first, nor the second, occasion in which the Court has received
19 outside communications about Defendant.⁵
20
21

22
23 ⁵This Court previously disclosed at a prior hearing that an individual recently employed
24 by Defendant was this Court's direct ecclesiastical leader (Kurt Teshima). This Court disclosed
25 to the parties that the Court holds Mr. Teshima in high esteem. These disclosures were made
26 for full transparency in the event that either party desired that the Court recuse from the
27 matter. Mr. Willick offered (as an offer of proof) at the August 30, 2017 hearing that
28 Defendant, *together with Mr. Sanson*, had a breakfast meeting with Mr. Teshima. As an
additional offer of proof, when Defendant and Mr. Sanson attempted to discuss the divorce,
Mr. Teshima redirected the conversation to business matters. This Court is not surprised by
this redirection by Mr. Teshima and emphasizes that at no time has Mr. Teshima *ever* discussed
this matter with the Court. This Court has never felt any pressure or attempts to influence the
path of this case from Mr. Teshima.

1
2 This Court recognizes the judicial duty to sit. Mr. Sanson's Sworn Declaration
3 filed on August 22, 2017, however, creates a conflict for the Court. Moreover, it has
4 become evident based on the history of this matter that any decision by this Court that
5 favors Defendant in any manner is perceived by Plaintiff as being influenced by
6 something that has happened outside of this courtroom. Similarly, Defendant may
7 have the perception that, because this Court has declared its disgust and disdain for
8 outside efforts to influence this matter, the Court is somehow overcompensating to
9 counter Plaintiff's perception. These perceptions (although untrue on both accounts)
10 are unfair to both parties. Accordingly, it is appropriate that this Court recuse from
11 this matter.
12

13
14 Finally, because there have been outside attempts to influence this Court in this
15 matter, complete transparency is warranted to maintain public confidence in the
16 administration of justice. Notably, Mr. Sanson (through counsel) argued that this
17 matter was improperly sealed. To clarify this Court's findings at the August 30, 2017
18 hearing, this Court concurs that the hearings in this matter and orders entered by the
19 Court should not be sealed and should be available for public inspection. However,
20 this Court recognizes that filings of the parties and experts contain sensitive
21 information related to both custody issues and financial issues. Consistent with NRS
22 125.110, those papers should remain sealed.
23
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


Based on the foregoing, and good cause appearing therefor,

It is hereby ORDERED that this Court RECUSE from this case. It is further ORDERED that, to the extent possible, this matter be referred to the Senior Judge Program for further proceedings.

It is further ORDERED that the hearings pending before this Court, including trial dates and hearings related to discovery issues, should be re-calendared upon the reassignment of this matter.

It is further ORDERED that the hearing videos and orders entered by this Court should be unsealed.

DATED this 5th day of September, 2017.


BRYCE C. DUCKWORTH
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
DEPARTMENT Q