

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT  
OF EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING &  
REHABILITATION, EMPLOYMENT  
SECURITY DIVISION,

Appellant,

vs.

SIERRA NATIONAL  
CORPORATION, doing business as  
THE LOVE RANCH, a Nevada  
Corporation,

Respondent.

Supreme Court Case No. 76639

District Case No. ~~Electronically Filed~~  
Sep 06 2018 11:40 a.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

Appeal from First Judicial District Court, State of Nevada,  
in and for Carson City

The Honorable James T. Russell

---

---

**RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S DOCKETING STATEMENT**

Anthony L. Hall, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 5977

[AHall@hollandhart.com](mailto:AHall@hollandhart.com)

Ricardo N. Cordova, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 11942

[RNCordova@hollandhart.com](mailto:RNCordova@hollandhart.com)

HOLLAND & HART LLP

5441 Kietzke Lane, Second Floor

Reno, Nevada 89511

*Attorneys for Respondent*

Pursuant to NRAP 14(f), Respondent Sierra National Corporation, dba The Love Ranch (“The Love Ranch”), responds to the Docketing Statement submitted by Appellant State of Nevada Department of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation, Employment Security Division (“DETR”). The Love Ranch strongly disagrees with DETR’s statement of the case and issues on appeal. DETR fundamentally mischaracterized the nature of this action and set forth an incomplete and inaccurate recitation of the facts and procedural history of this dispute, thereby obfuscating its violations of the Nevada Public Records Act (“NPRA”). And, rather than concisely stating the primary issues on appeal, DETR submitted a disorganized, lengthy diatribe. DETR’s tactics waste valuable judicial resources, needlessly drive up fees and costs, and frustrate the purpose of a docketing statement. *See* NRAP 14(a)(3).

Given the page limit in NRAP 14(f), however, The Love Ranch will reserve a detailed rebuttal for its Answering Brief. For today’s purposes, it suffices to say that the only apparent point of agreement between the Parties is that this appeal should be considered by the *en banc* Supreme Court. Such consideration is warranted given the important NPRA issues at stake, including: (1) whether litigants to an administrative proceeding lose their rights under the NPRA, (2) the scope of the NPRA as it pertains to unemployment compensation matters, and (3) whether a governmental agency waives any objections it fails to raise in its denial of an NPRA request.

DATED: September 6, 2018.

/s/ Ricardo N. Cordova  
Anthony L. Hall, Esq.,  
Ricardo N. Cordova, Esq.,  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
*Attorneys for Respondent*

## AFFIRMATION

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document DOES NOT contain the Social Security Number or employer identification number of any person or party.

DATED: September 6, 2018.

/s/ Ricardo N. Cordova  
Anthony L. Hall, Esq.,  
Ricardo N. Cordova, Esq.,  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
*Attorneys for Respondent*

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I electronically filed the forgoing **RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S DOCKETING STATEMENT** with the Clerk of Court for the Supreme Court of Nevada by using the Supreme Court of Nevada's E-filing system on September 6, 2018.

I further certify that all parties to this case are registered with the Supreme Court of Nevada's E-filing system, and that service has been accomplished to the following individual(s) through the Court's E-filing System:

Laurie L. Trotter, Esq.  
Senior Counsel  
Nevada Unemployment Security Division  
500 East Third Street  
Carson City, NV 89713

Dated this 6th day of September, 2018.

/s/ Jennifer L. Smith  
Jennifer L. Smith