

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLERK OF THE COURT

REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER 200 LEWIS AVENUE, 3<sup>rd</sup> FI. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89155-1160 (702) 671-4554 Electronically Filed Mar 07 2018 11:04 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Anntoinette Naumec-Miller Acting Court Division Administrator

Steven D. Grierson Clerk of the Court

March 7, 2018

Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of the Court 201 South Carson Street, Suite 201 Carson City, Nevada 89701-4702

RE: APCO CONSTRUCTION vs. GEMSTONE DEVELOPMENT WEST, INC.; SCOTT FINANCIAL CORPORATION; COMMONWEALTH LAND TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY; FIRST AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY

S.C. CASE: 75197

D.C. CASE: 08A571228 (LEAD CASE)

Dear Ms. Brown:

On February 21, 2018 our office submitted a Notice of Appeal packet for the above referenced case noting that the minutes from January 19, 2018 were not included. The minutes have now been completed and are enclosed. Please contact our office at (702) 671-0512 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

STEVEN D. GRIERSON, CLERK OF THE COURT

Heather Ungermann, Deputy Clerk

## DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

<b>Business Court</b>		COURT MINUTES	January 19, 2018
08A571228	Apco Construction, Plaintiff(s) vs. Gemstone Development West Inc, Defendant(s)		
January 19, 2018	9:00 AM	Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Per Judgment Pursuant to NRCP Order Shortening Time	nding Entry of Final
HEARD BY: Denton, Mark R.		COURTROOM: F	RJC Courtroom 03D

COURT CLERK: Elizabeth Vargas

**RECORDER:** Jennifer Gerold

PARTIES Lai, I-Che Attorney for Counter Defendant Zitting Brothers

PRESENT: Construction Inc.

Mounteer, Cody S. Attorney for Plaintiff Apco Construction

## **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Mr. Mounteer stated the original motion was brought during a time when there were pending motions for reconsideration, and conceded the issue was moot, however the rule was still operative; further noted there were multiple parties and multiple claims, this was a large consolidation action Zitting was part of, requested a temporary stay pending the conclusion of trial, amongst all parties, with no bond; stated should the stay be granted, the bond would be in place to protect Zitting. Mr. Lai opposed the Motion; stated Zitting was trying to perfect the final judgment and once final judgment was entered can move forward with collection. Court noted there was no final judgment. Mr. Mounteer stated it his position that there was no final judgment and did not believe collection efforts could start. Court reviewed Rule 62 and stated it believes Apco was seeking to stay execution on the judgment. Mr. Moutneer requested if the motion was denied, it be stated in the order that there was no final judgment at that time. COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to renewal once there has been entry of final judgment or certification. Court noted it did not consider the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law Granting Zitting Brothers Construction Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Against Apco entered on January 2, 2018 to be a judgment subject to execution. Court directed Mr. Moutneer to prepare the Order.

PRINT DATE: 02/21/2018 Page 1 of 1 Minutes Date: January 19, 2018