IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TRUDI LEE LYTLE; AND JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, AS TRUSTEES OF THE LYTLE TRUST,

Appellant,

v.

MARJORIE B. BOULDEN, TRUSTEE OF THE MARJORIE B. BOULDEN TRUST; LINDA LAMOTHE; AND JACQUES LAMOTHE, TRUSTEES OF THE JACQUES & LINDA LAMOTHE LIVING TRUST,

Respondents.

Supreme Court No.: 73039

District Court Case No.: A-16-747800-C

Electronically Filed Aug 01 2017 03:54 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

DEFENDANTS TRUDI LEE LYTLE, JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, THE LYTLE TRUST'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

COMES NOW Defendants TRUDI LEE LYTLE, JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, AS TRUSTEES OF THE LYTLE TRUST (the "Trust"), by and through their counsel of record, Richard E. Haskin, Esq., and Timothy Elson, Esq., of the law firm of GIBBS, GIDEN, LOCHER, TURNER, SENET & WITTBRODT, LLP, and hereby submits its Supplemental Response to Order to Show Cause.

I. BRIEF STATEMENT OF MATERIAL AND UNDISPUTED FACTS

On July 21, 2017, the Trust provided an initial Response the Order to Show Cause. Therein, the Trust provided this Court with a copy of the District Court's Order Granting Respondents' Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit A to the Response to Order to Show Cause.

Thereafter, the District Court granted the Trust's Motion to Alter or Amend Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, wherein the District Court removed the finding of slander of title. See Notice of Entry of Order and Order Granting Motion to Alter or Amend Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, Exhibit A. As a result, the Respondent is pursuing the slander of title claim in the District Court litigation.

However, the District Court did not alter or amend the injunction previously granted, and the same order is contained in the revised Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. *See* Notice of Entry of Order and Order Granting Motion to Alter or Amend Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, <u>Exhibit A</u>.

On June 2, 2017, Appellants filed a Docketing Statement with this Supreme Court indicating that one of the basis for appeal was that the underling order granted an injunction. See Docketing Statement, Exhibit B, Section 4. Further, this injunction was the an issue noted on appeal. *Id.* at Section 9. Finally, the Docketing Statement provides that NRAP 3(b)(3) serves as the basis for this Court's jurisdiction. *Id.* at Section 21.

II. BASIS FOR APPEAL

The Supreme Court has jurisdiction to consider the appeal of any order from a district court in a civil action "granting...an injunction..." NRAP 3(b)(3). Here, the District Court granted an injunction, permanently enjoining Appellants from clouding title to Respondents' property or recording any abstract of judgment. This matter is fit for appeal.

DATED: August 1, 2017

GIBBS GIDEN LOCHER TURNER SENET & WHTTBRODT LLP

By:

Richard E. Haskin, Esq. Nevada State Bar # 11592

1140 N. Town Center Drive, Suite 300

Las Vegas, Nevada 89144 Attorneys for Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned, an employee of the law firm of GIBBS GIDEN LOCHER TURNER SENET & WITTBRODT LLP, hereby certifies that on August 1, 2017, she served a copy of the foregoing DEFENDANTS TRUDI LEE LYTLE, JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, THE LYTLE TRUST'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE by electronic service through the Nevada Supreme Court ECF System:

DANIEL T. FOLEY, ESQ. FOLEY & OAKS 626 S. 8th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorneys for Plaintiffs MARJORIE BOULDEN, TRUSTEE OF THE MARJORIE B. BOULDEN TRUST, ETAL.

Tel: (702) 384-2070 Fax: (702) 384-2128 Email: dan@foleyoakes.com

Persi J. Mishel 2725 Tidewater Court Las Vegas, Nevada 89117 Settlement Judge

Tel: (702) 981-3043

An employee of

Gibbs Giden Locher Turner Senet & Wittbrodt LLP

1923790.1

CLERK OF THE COURT 1 **NEOJ** Richard E. Haskin, Esq. Nevada State Bar # 11592 2 Timothy P. Elson, Esq. Nevada State Bar # 11559 3 GIBBS GIDEN LOCHER TURNER SENET & WITTBRODT LLP 4 1140 N. Town Center Drive, Suite 300 Las Vegas, Nevada 89144-0596 5 (702) 836-9800 6 Attorneys for Defendants TRUDI LEE LYTLE, JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, 7 & THE LYTLE TRUST 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 A-16-747800-C Case No.: MARJORIE B. BOULDEN, TRUSTEE OF THE 11 MARJORIE B. BOULDEN TRUST, LINDA Dept.: XVI LAMOTHE AND JACQUES LAMOTHE, 12 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER TRUSTEES OF THE JACQUES & LINDA GRANTING MOTION TO ALTER OR LAMOTHE LIVING TRUST 13 AMEND FINDINGS OF FACT AND **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW** Plaintiff, 14 ٧. 15 TRUDI LEE LYTLE, JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, THE LYTLE TRUST, DOES I through X, 16 inclusive, and ROE CORPORATIONS I through 17 X, Defendants. 18 NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on the 25th day of July, 2017, an ORDER GRANTING 19 MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW was 20 entered in the above-entitled matter, a copy of which is attached hereto. 21 GIBBS GIDEN LOCHER TURNER 22 DATED: July 25, 2017 SENET & WITTBRODT LLP 23 24 /s/ Richard E. Haskin 25 Richard E. Haskin, Esq. Nevada State Bar # 11592 1140 N. Town Center Drive, Suite 300 26 Las Vegas, Nevada 89144 27 Attorneys for Defendants

Electronically Filed 7/25/2017 3:27 PM Steven D. Grierson

LYTLE TRUST

TRUDI LEE LYTLE, JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, & THE

1	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
2	The undersigned, an employee of the law firm of GIBBS GIDEN LOCHER TURNER
3	SENET & WITTBRODT LLP, hereby certifies that on July 25, 2017, she served a copy of the
4	foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND
5	FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW by electronic service through the
6	Regional Justice Center for Clark County, Nevada's ECF System:
7	DANIEL T. FOLEY, ESQ. Attorneys for Plaintiffs MARJORIE
8	FOLEY & OAKS 626 S, 8 th Street BOULDEN, TRUSTEE OF THE MARJORIE B. BOULDEN TRUST, ETAL.
9	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Tel: (702) 384-2070
10	Fax: (702) 384-2128 Email: dan@folevoakes.com
11	
12	Carre
13	An employee of
14	An employee of Gibbs Giden Locher Turner Senet & Wittbrodt LLP
15	Sener & Witterest Edit
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1918793.I

7/25/2017 1:52 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT 1 ORDR Richard E. Haskin, Esq. Nevada State Bar # 11592 2 Timothy P. Elson, Esq. Nevada State Bar # 11559 3 GIBBS GIDEN LOCHER TURNER SENET & WITTBRODT LLP 4 1140 N. Town Center Drive, Suite 300 Las Vegas, Nevada 89144-0596 5 (702) 836-9800 6 Attorneys for Defendants TRUDI LEE LYTLE, JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, 7 & THE LYTLE TRUST 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 11 A-16-747800-C MARJORIE B. BOULDEN, TRUSTEE OF THE Case No.: 12 XVI MARJORIE B. BOULDEN TRUST, LINDA Dept.: LAMOTHE AND JACQUES LAMOTHE, 13 ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO TRUSTEES OF THE JACQUES & LINDA ALTER OR AMEND FINDINGS OF FACT LAMOTHE LIVING TRUST 14 AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW Plaintiff, 15 Hearing: June 29, 2017 v. 16 TRUDI LEE LYTLE, JOHN ALLEN LYTLE, THE LYTLE TRUST, DOES I through X, 17 inclusive, and ROE CORPORATIONS I through 18 19 Defendants. 20 Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Defendants' Counter Motion for 21 Summary Judgment having come on for hearing before this Court on of April 13, 2017. Plaintiffs 22 Marjorie Boulden and Linda Lamothe appeared with their counsel, Daniel T. Foley, Esq. and 23 Defendants John Allen Lytle and Trudi Lee Lytle, as Trustees of the Lytle Trust, appeared with their 24 counsel, Richard Haskin, Esq. After hearing, the Court entered Findings of Fact, Conclusions of 25 Law and entered an Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on April 25, 26 27 2017. 28 111

Electronically Filed

1 .

On June 29, 2017, Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration or, in the Alternative, Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment, came on for hearing. Plaintiffs Marjorie Boulden and Linda Lamothe appeared with their counsel, Daniel T. Foley, Esq. and Defendants John Allen Lytle and Trudi Lee Lytle, as Trustees of the Lytle Trust, appeared with their counsel, Richard Haskin, Esq.

The Court having reviewed the Defendants' Motion, Plaintiff's Opposition and the Defendants' Reply, all documents attached thereto or otherwise filed in this case, and good cause appearing therefore, grants Defendants' Motion to Alter and Amend Judgment pursuant to EDCR 2.24(b), and the Court makes the following Amendment Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Mrs. Boulden is trustee of the Marjorie B. Boulden Trust (hereinafter "Mrs. Boulden") which owns that residential property known as parcel number 163-03-313-008 also known as 1960 Rosemere Ct., Las Vegas, NV 89117 ("the Boulden Property").
- 2. Mr. and Mrs. Lamothe are the trustees of the Linda Lamothe and Jacques Lamothe Living Trust (hereinafter "Mr. and Mrs. Lamothe") which owns that certain residential property known as parcel number 163-03-313-002 also known as 1830 Rosemere Ct., Las Vegas, NV 89117 (the "Lamothe Property").
- 3. The Boulden Property and the Lamothe Property are located in the Rosemere Court subdivision and are subject to the CC&Rs recorded January 4, 1994 (the "Original CC&Rs").
- 4. John Allen Lytle and Trudi Lee Lytle are the Trustees of the Lytle Trust (collectively the "Defendants") which owns that certain residential property known as parcel number 163-03-313-009 (the "Lytle Property").
- 5. In 2009, the Defendants sued the Rosemere Estates Property Owners Association (the Association") in the Eighth Judicial District Court, case # A-09-593497-C (the "Rosemere LPA Litigation").
 - 6. None of the Plaintiffs were ever parties in the Rosemere LPA Litigation.
- 7. None of the Plaintiffs were a "losing party" in the Rosemere LPA Litigation as that term is found in Section 25 of the Original CC&Rs.

- 8. The Defendants obtained a Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief from the District Court in the Rosemere LPA Litigation, which found and ruled as follows:
 - a. The Association is a limited purpose association under NRS 116.1201, is not a Chapter 116 "unit-owners' association," and is relegated to only those specific duties and powers set forth in Paragraph 21 of the Original CC&Rs and NRS 116.1201.
 - b. The Association did not have any powers beyond those of the "property owners committee" designation in the Original CC&Rs simply to care for the landscaping and other common elements of Rosemere Estates as set forth in Paragraph 21 of the Original CC&Rs.
 - c. Consistent with the absence of a governing body, the Developer provided each homeowner the right to independently enforce the Original CC&Rs against one another.
 - d. The Amended and Restated CC&Rs recorded with the Clark County Recorder's Office as Instrument #20070703-0001934 (the "Amended CC&Rs") are invalid, and the Amended CC&Rs have no force and effect.
- 9. Pursuant to NRS 116,1201(2) much of NRS Chapter 116 does not apply to the Association because it is a limited purpose association that is not a rural agricultural residential community.
- 10. After obtaining Summary Judgment in the Rosemere LPA Litigation, the Defendants filed a Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs against the Association, and conducted a prove-up hearing on damages. After hearing all matters, a Final Judgment was entered in the Defendants' favor against the Association for \$361,238.59, which includes damages, attorneys' fees and costs (the "Final Judgment").
- 11. After obtaining the Attorneys' Fees Judgment, the Defendants, on August 16, 2016, recorded with the Clark County Recorder's office an Abstract of Judgement referencing the Final Judgment against the Association, recorded as Instrument #20160818-0001198 (the "First Abstract of Judgment").
- 12. In the First Abstract of Judgment, the Defendants listed the parcel numbers of the Boulden Property and the Lamothe Property as properties to which the First Abstract of Judgment and Final Judgment was to attach.

|| ///

13. On S	eptember 2, 2016, the Defendants recorded with the Clark County Recorder's
office an Abstract of	f Judgement referencing the Final Judgment against the Association, recorded as
Instrument #201609	002-0002684 (the "Second Abstract of Judgment"). The Second Abstract of
Judgment listed the	e parcel number of the Lamothe Property only as the property to which the
Judgment was to atta	ach.

14. On September 2, 2016, the Defendants recorded with the Clark County Recorder's office an Abstract of Judgement referencing the Final Judgment against the Association, recorded as Instrument #20160902-0002690 (the "Third Abstract of Judgment"). The Third Abstract of Judgment listed the parcel number of the Boulden Property only as the property to which the Judgment was to attach.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Association is a "limited purpose association" as referenced in NRS 116.1201(2).
- 2. As a limited purpose association, NRS 116.3117 is not applicable to the Association.
- 3. As a result of the Rosemere LPA Litigation, the Amended CC&Rs were judicially declared to have been improperly adopted and recorded, the Amended CC&Rs are invalid and have no force and effect and were declared void ab initio.
 - 4. The Plaintiffs were not parties to the Rosemere LPA Litigation.
- 5. The Plaintiffs were not "losing parties" in the Rosemere LPA Litigation as per Section 25 of the Original CC&Rs.
- 6. The Final Judgment in favor of the Defendants is not against, and is not an obligation of, the Plaintiffs.
- 7. The Final Judgment against the Association is not an obligation or debt owed by the Plaintiffs.
- 8. The First Abstract of Judgment recorded as Instrument #20160818-0001198 was improperly recorded against the Lamothe Property and constitutes a cloud against the Lamothe Property.

28 | ///

Property.

9. The First Abstract of Judgment recorded as Instrument #20160818-0001198 was
improperly recorded against the Boulden Property and constitutes a cloud against the Boulden
Property.
10. The Second Abstract of Judgment recorded as Instrument #20160902-0002684
improperly recorded against the Lamothe Property and constitutes a cloud against the Lamothe

- 11. The Third Abstract of Judgment recorded as Instrument #20160902-0002690 was improperly recorded against the Boulden Property and constitutes a cloud against the Boulden Property.
- 12. The Court does not make any findings that the Defendants slandered title to Plaintiffs' properties, and this issue is left to trier of fact.

ORDER

Based upon the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law above, and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment is GRANTED as to Plaintiffs' claims and causes of action for quiet title and declaratory relief, the Second and Third Causes of Action in Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Defendants improperly clouded the title to the Boulden Property.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Defendants improperly clouded the title to the Lamothe Property.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the First Abstract of Judgment recorded as Instrument #20160818-0001198 in the Clark County Recorder's Office is hereby expunged and stricken from the records of the Clark County Recorder's Office.

28 | ///

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Second
Abstract of Judgment recorded as Instrument #20160902-0002684 in the Clark County Recorder's
Office is hereby expunged and stricken from the records of the Clark County Recorder's Office.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Third Abstract of Judgment recorded as Instrument #20160902-0002690 in the Clark County Recorder's Office is hereby expunged and stricken from the records of the Clark County Recorder's Office.

/// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///

1918793.1

2	Rosemere LPA Litigation or any abstracts related thereto against the Boulden Property of the
3	Lamothe Property.
4	IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the
5	Defendants are permanently enjoined from taking any action in the future against the Plaintiffs or
6	their properties based upon the Rosemere LPA Litigation.
7	IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the
8	Defendants are hereby ordered to release the First Abstract of Judgment, the Second Abstract of
9	Judgment, and the Third Abstract of Judgment recorded with the Clark County Recorder within
10	
11	ten (10) days after the date of Notice of Entry of this Order.
12	
13	DATED this 19 day of Guly 2017
14	
15	TAD O
16	DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
17	Submitted by:
18	FOLEY & OAKES, PC
19	Daniel T. Foley, Esq.
20	626 S. 8 th St.
21	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorney for Plaintiffs
22	Approved to form:
23	
24	Richard E. Haskin, Esq.
25	Gibbs Orden Locker Turner Senet & Wittbrodt LLP
26	Las Vegas, Nevada 89144 Attorney for Defendants

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the

Defendants are permanently enjoined from recording and enforcing the Final Judgment from the