

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRANCH BANKING & TRUST
COMPANY, a North Carolina
corporation,

Appellant,

vs.

DOUGLAS D. GERRARD, ESQ.,
individually; and GERRARD & COX, a
Nevada professional corporation, d/b/a
GERRARD COX & LARSEN; JOHN
DOE INDIVIDUALS I-X; and ROE
BUSINESS ENTITIES XI-XX,

Respondents.

Electronically Filed
Nov 13 2018 03:15 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Supreme Court No. 73848

District Court Case No. A-16-744561-C

ERRATA TO RESPONDENTS' ANSWERING BRIEF

Respondents Douglas D. Gerrard and Gerrard Cox, by and through their counsel, hereby file their Errata to Respondents' Answering Brief. Appellant's counsel yesterday graciously advised that Respondents' Answering Brief incorrectly identifies a quoted BB&T filing. Therefore, Respondents file their Errata to make this correction.

On page 39 of Respondents' Answering Brief, Respondents stated:

BB&T's petition for writ of certiorari in the Priority Litigation did not involve any of these circumstances. **The issues identified by BB&T for review in its writ petition to the USSC included strictly evidence-based questions, specifically....**

The bolded language is incorrect. It should read:

The issues identified by BB&T in its brief to the Nevada Supreme Court included strictly evidence-based questions, specifically....

Similarly, page 40 of Respondents' Answering Brief includes the sentence:

Given that none of the issues **identified by** BB&T's writ petition were potential subjects within the scope of review by the USSC, it was practically guaranteed that the USSC would deny certiorari.

The bolded language is incorrect. BB&T's petition is not in the record on this appeal. The sentence should read:

Given that none of the issues **preserved for** BB&T's writ petition were potential subjects within the scope of review by the USSC, it was practically guaranteed that the USSC would deny certiorari.

Respondents' Errata correctly reflect the argument Respondents had raised below in its Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint (III. AA0632.). This does not raise any new arguments.

Dated: November 13, 2018.

GORDON REES SCULLY
MANSUKHANI, LLP

/s/ Craig J. Mariam

Craig J. Marian, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 10926
Robert S. Larsen, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 7785
Wing Yan Wong, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 13622
300 So. 4th Street, Suite 1550
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Tel: (702) 577-9300
Fax: (702) 255-2858

Attorneys for Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRAP 25(c), I hereby certify that I am an employee of GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP, and that on this 13th day of November, 2018, the foregoing **ERRATA TO RESPONDENTS' ANSWERING BRIEF**, was E-filed/E-Served electronically with the Clerk of the Nevada Supreme Court, and therefore electronic service was made in accordance with the master service list as follows:

G. Mark Albright, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 1394

D. Chris Albright, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 4904

ALBRIGHT, STODDARD,

WARNICK & ALBRIGHT

801 South Rancho Drive, Suite D-4

Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

Tel: (702) 384-7111

Fax: (702) 384-0605

gma@albrightstoddard.com

dca@albrightstoddard.com

Attorneys for Appellant

/s/ Gayle Angulo

An Employee of GORDON REES
SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP