Exhibit 1

Electronically Filed 9/28/2018 6:26 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

		CLERK OF THE COURT
1	SPENCER FANE LLP	Stewn & Summe
2	John H. Mowbray, Esq. (Bar No. 1140) John Randall Jefferies, Esq. (Bar No. 3512)	a digitaly-re-re-
	Mary E. Bacon, Esq. (Bar No. 12686) 300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 950	
	Las Vegas, NV 89101	
4	Telephone: (702) 408-3411 Facsimile: (702) 408-3401	
5	E-mail: <u>JMowbray@spencerfane.com</u>	
6	RJefferies@spencerfane.com	
	MBacon@spencerfane.com	
7	-and-	
8		
9	MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING Jack Chen Min Juan, Esq. (Bar No. 6367)	
10	Cody S. Mounteer, Esq. (Bar No. 11220)	
	10001 Park Run Drive	
11	Las Vegas, NV 89145	
12	Telephone: 702.207.6089 Email: jjuan@maclaw.com	
13	cmounteer@maclaw.com	
14	Attorneys for Apco Construction, Inc.	
15		
16	DISTRIC	r COURT
	CLARK COUN	TTY, NEVADA
17	APCO CONSTRUCTION, a Nevada	Case No.: A571228
18	corporation,	Dept. No.: XIII
19	Plaintiff,	Consolidated with:
20	v.	A574391; A574792; A577623; A583289; A587168; A580889; A584730; A589195;
21		A595552; A597089; A592826; A589677;
22	GEMSTONE DEVELOPMENT WEST, INC., A Nevada corporation,	A596924; A584960; A608717; A608718; and A590319
23		NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER (1)
	Defendant,	GRANTING APCO CONSTRUCTION.
24		INC. MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS FEES AND COSTS (2) GRANTING APCO
25		CONSTRUCTION, INC.'S
26		MEMORANDUM OF COSTS IN PART
27		(3) GRANTING HELIX ELECTRIC OF NEVADA LLC'S MOTION TO RETAX
28		IN PART AND DENYING IN PART (4)
20		GRANTING PLAINTIFF

INTERVENTION NATIONAL WOOD PRODUCTS LLC'S MOTION TO RETAX IN PART AND DENYING IN PART AND (5) GRANTING NATIONAL WOOD PRODUCTS, INC.'S MOTION TO FILE A SURREPLY

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS

TO: All parties herein and their respective counsel:

YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on the 27th day of September, 2018, a ORDER (1) GRANTING APCO CONSTRUCTION, INC. MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS FEES AND COSTS (2) GRANTING APCO CONSTRUCTION, INC.'S MEMORANDUM OF COSTS IN PART (3) GRANTING HELIX ELECTRIC OF NEVADA LLC'S MOTION TO RETAX IN PART AND DENYING IN PART (4) GRANTING PLAINTIFF INTERVENTION NATIONAL WOOD PRODUCTS LLC'S MOTION TO RETAX IN PART AND DENYING IN PART AND (5) GRANTING NATIONAL WOOD PRODUCTS, INC.'S MOTION TO FILE A

SURREPLY was entered in the above case. A copy is attached.

DATED: September 28, 2018.

SPENCER FANE LLP

By: /s/ Mary E. Bacon John H. Mowbray, Esq. (Bar No. 1140) John Randall Jefferies, Esq. (Bar No. 3512) Mary E. Bacon, Esq. (Bar No. 12686) 300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 950 Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: (702) 408-3411 Facsimile: (702) 408-3401 Attorneys for Apco Construction, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Counter Claimant: Camco Pacific Construction Co Inc

Steven L. Morris (steve@gmdlegal.com)

Intervenor Plaintiff: Cactus Rose Construction Inc

Eric B. Zimbelman (ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com)

Intervenor Plaintiff: Interstate Plumbing & Air Conditioning Inc

Jonathan S. Dabbieri (dabbieri@sullivanhlll.com)

Intervenor: National Wood Products, Inc.'s

Dana Y Kim (dkim@caddenfuller.com)

Richard L Tobler (rititdck@hotmail.com)

Richard Reincke (rreincke@caddenfuller.com)

S. Judy Hirahara (jhirahara@caddenfuller.com)

Tammy Cortez (tcortez@caddenfuller.com)

Other: Chaper 7 Trustee

Elizabeth Stephens (stephens@sullivanhill.com)

Gianna Garcia (ggarcia@sullivanhill.com)

Jennifer Saurer (Saurer@sullivanhill.com)

27 Jonathan Dabbieri (dabbieri@sullivanhill.com)

25

26

27

1	Caleb Langsdale . (Caleb@Langsdalelaw.com)
2	Calendar . (calendar@litigationservices.com)
3	Cheri Vandermeulen . (cvandermeulen@dickinsonwright.com)
4	Christine Spencer . (cspencer@dickinsonwright.com)
	Christine Taradash . (CTaradash@maazlaw.com)
5	Cindy Simmons . (csimmons@djplaw.com)
6	Courtney Peterson (cpeterson@maclaw.com)
7	Cynthia Kelley (ckelley@nevadafirm.com)
8	Dana Y. Kim . (dkim@caddenfuller.com)
	David J. Merrill . (david@djmerrillpc.com)
9	David R. Johnson . (djohnson@watttieder.com)
10	Debbie Holloman . (dholloman@jamsadr.com) Debbie Rosewall . (dr@juww.com)
11	Debra Hitchens . (dhitchens@maazlaw.com)
12	Depository (Depository@litigationservices.com)
13	District filings . (district@trumanlegal.com)
	Donna Wolfbrandt . (dwolfbrandt@dickinsonwright.com)
14	Douglas D. Gerrard . (dgerrard@gerrard-cox.com)
15	E-File Desk . (EfileLasVegas@wilsonelser.com)
16	Elizabeth Martin (em@juww.com)
17	Eric Dobberstein . (edobberstein@dickinsonwright.com)
18	Eric Zimbelman . (ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com)
	Erica Bennett . (e.bennett@kempjones.com)
19	Floyd Hale . (fhale@floydhale.com)
20	George Robinson . (grobinson@pezzillolloyd.com)
21	Glenn F. Meier . (gmeier@nevadafirm.com)
22	Gwen Rutar Mullins . (grm@h2law.com)
23	Hrustyk Nicole . (Nicole.Hrustyk@wilsonelser.com)
	I-Che Lai . (I-Che.Lai@wiisonelser.com)
24	Jack Juan . (jjuan@marquisaurbach.com)
25	Jennifer Case . (jcase@madaw.com)
26	Jennifer MacDonald . (jmacdonald@watttieder.com)
27	Jennifer R. Lloyd . (Jiloyd@pezzillolloyd.com)
28	Jineen DeAngelis . (jdeangelis@foxrothschild.com)
20	

1	Jorge Ramirez . (Jorge.Ramirez@wilsonelser.com)
2	Kathleen Morris . (kmorris@modonaldcarano.com)
3	Kaytiyn Bassett . (kbassett@gerrard-cox.com)
	Kelly McGee . (kom@juww.com)
4	Kenzie Dunn . (kdunn@btjd.com)
5	Lani Maile . (Lani.Maile@wilsonelser.com)
6	Legal Assistant . (rrlegalassistant@rookerlaw.com)
7	Linda Compton . (icompton@ggits.com)
	Marie Ogella . (mogella@gordonrees.com)
8	Michael R. Ernst . (mre@juww.com)
9	Michael Rawlins . (mrawlins@rookerlaw.com)
10	Pamela Montgomery . (pym@kempjones.com)
11	Phillip Aurbach . (paurbach@maclaw.com)
	Rachel E. Donn . (rdonn@nevadafirm.com)
12	Rebecca Chapman . (rebecca.chapman@procopio.com)
13	Receptionist . (Reception@nvbusinesslawyers.com)
14	
15	Renee Hoban . (rhoban@nevadafirm.com)
	Richard I. Dreitzer . (rdreitzer@foxrothschild.com)
16	Richard Tobler . (rititdck@hotmail.com)
17	Rosey Jeffrey . (rjeffrey@peelbrimley.com)
18	Ryan Bellows . (rbellows@mcdonaldcarano.com)
	S. Judy Hirahara . (jhirahara@caddenfuller.com)
19	Sarah A. Mead . (sam@juww.com)
20	Steven Morris . (steve@gmdlegal.com)
21	Tammy Cortez . (tcortez@caddenfuller.com)
22	Taylor Fong . (tfong@marquisaurbach.com)
	Terri Hansen . (thansen@peelbrimley.com)
23	Timother E. Salter . (tim.salter@procopio.com)
24	Wade B. Gochnour . (wbg@h2law.com)
25	

/s/ Elizabeth Kuchman
An employee of Spencer Fane LLP

Electronically Filed 9/27/2018 9:21 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

ODR 1 Spencer Fane LLP John H. Mowbray, Esq. (Bar No. 1140) John Randall Jefferies, Esq. (Bar No. 3512) Mary E. Bacon, Esq. (Bar No. 12686) 300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 950 2 3 Las Vegas, NV 89101 4 Telephone: (702) 408-3411 Facsimile: (702) 408-3401 5 E-mail:JMowbray@spencerfane.com RJefferies@spencerfane.com 6 MBacon@spencerfane.com -and-7 Marquis Aurbach Coffing Jack Chen Min Juan, Esq. (Bar No. 6367) 8 Cody S. Mounteer, Esq. (Bar No. 11220) 10001 Park Run Drive 9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Telephone: (702) 382-0711 Facsimile: (702) 382-5816 jjuan@maclaw.com 10 11 cmounteer@maclaw.com 12 Attorneys for APCO Construction 13 DISTRICT COURT 14 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 15 APCO CONSTRUCTION, a Nevada A571228 corporation, Case No.: 16 Dept. No.: XIII Plaintiff, 17 Consolidated with: A574391; A574792; A577623; A583289; VS. 18 A587168; A580889; A584730; A589195; GEMSTONE DEVELOPMENT WEST, INC., A A595552; A597089; A592826; A589677; 19 A596924; A584960; A608717; A608718 and Nevada corporation, A590319 20 Defendant. ORDER: 21 (1) GRANTING APCO CONSTRUCTION, INC. MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS FEES 22 AND COSTS 23 (2) GRANTING APCO CONSTRUCTION. INC.'S MEMORANDUM OF COSTS IN DISTRICT COURT DEPT#13 PART (3) GRANTING HELIX ELECTRIC OF NEVADA LLC'S MOTION TO RETAX IN PART AND DENYING IN PART Page I of 7

5

4

6 7

8 9

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27 20 N PART AND DENYING IN PART

-AND-

GRANTING NATIONAL PRODUCTS, INC.'S MOTION TO FILE A SURREPLY

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS

On July 19, 2018, the Court heard the following motions: (1) APCO Construction Inc.'s Motion for Attorneys Fees and Costs; (2) APCO Construction, Inc.'s Memorandum of Costs [Against Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC and Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc.]; (3) Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc.'s Motion to Retax Costs Re: Defendant APCO Construction, Inc.'s Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements Against Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc. with Joinder by Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC, (4) Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC's Motion to Retax Costs Re: Defendant APCO Construction, Inc.'s Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements with Joinder by Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc., and (5) National Wood Products, Inc.'s Ex Parte Motion for Order Shortening Time to Hear Motion for Order Permitting Leave to File Surreply to APCO Construction's Reply to National Wood Products, Inc.'s Opposition to Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

John Randall Jefferies, Esq. and Mary Bacon, Esq. of the law firm of Spencer Fane appeared on behalf of APCO Construction, Inc. ("APCO"); Eric Zimbleman, Esq. of the law firm of Peel Brimley appeared on behalf of Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC ("Helix"), and John Taylor, Esq. and S. Judy Hirahara, Esq. of the law firm of Cadden Fuller and Richard Tobler, Esq. of the law firm Richard Tobler, Ltd. appeared on behalf of Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc. ("National Wood"), the Court having heard oral argument and examined the records and documents on file in the above-entitled matter and being fully advised on the premises, hereby ORDERS as follows, having rendered its Decision filed on August 8, 2018:

1. APCO Construction, Inc.'s Motion for Attorneys Fees and Costs Against Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC and Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc. and APCO Construction, Inc.'s Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements [Against Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC and Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc.].

APCO requested attorney's fees from Helix and National Wood pursuant to the subcontracts at issue and pursuant to APCO's November 13, 2018 offers of judgment. APCO also sought an award of attorney's fees against Helix pursuant to NRS 108.237(3). The Court finds that although there are certainly viable bases supporting APCO's contention that contractual provisions in the repesective subcontracts and equitable estoppel can support an award of attorney's fees going back in time to a point long before making of the November 13, 2018 offers of judgment, the Court determines, in the context of this complex case, involving multiple parties and claims and consolidation of cases and periodic party alignments and realignments and contractual reconfigurations, that the best basis for attorney fee awards is NRCP 68.

NRCP 68 provides in part that at "any time more than 10 days before trial, any party may serve an offer in writing to allow judgment to be taken in accordance with its terms and conditions." "If the offer is not accepted within 10 days after service, it shall be considered rejected by the offeree and deemed withdrawn by the offeror." And "[i]f the offeree rejects an offer and fails to obtain a more favorable judgment, (1) the offeree cannot recover any costs or attorney's fees and shall not recover interest for the period after the service of the offer and before the judgment; and (2) the offeree shall pay the offeror's post-offer costs, applicable interest on the judgment from the time of the offer to the time of entry of the judgment and reasonable attorney's fees, if any be allowed, actually incurred by the offeror from the time of the offer."

The purpose of NRCP 68 is to promote and encourage settlement and save time and money for the court system, the parties, and the taxpayers.⁴ It rewards a party who makes a

NRCP 68(a).

² NRCP 68(e).

³ NRCP 68(f).

⁴ Muije v. A N. Las Vegas Cab Co., 106 Nev. 664, 667, 799 P.2d 559, 561 (1990).

reasonable offer to settle a lawsuit and punishes the party who refuses to accept such an offer.
"NRCP 68 encourages the settlement of lawsuits by raising the stakes for a litigant who receives an offer of judgment. An offeree must balance the uncertainty of receiving a more favorable judgment against the risk of receiving a less favorable judgment and being forced to pay the offeror's costs and attorney's fees." In reviewing an application for an award of attorney's fee pursuant to NRCP 68, "the trial court must carefully evaluate the following factors: (1) whether the plaintiff's claim was brought in good faith; (2) whether the defendants' offer of judgment was reasonable and in good faith in both its timing and amount; (3) whether the plaintiff's decision to reject the offer and proceed to trial was grossly unreasonable or in bad faith; and (4) whether the fees sought by the offeror are reasonable and justified in amount." "After weighing the foregoing factors, the district judge may, where warranted, award up to the full amount of fees requested." An award will not be disturbed if the record is clear that the district court considered the factors and the court's award is not arbitrary or capricious. No single factor under Beattie is determinative. The district court has broad discretion to grant the request as long as all appropriate factors are at least considered.

On November 13, 2018, APCO made an offer of judgment to Helix for \$25,000 and an offer of judgment to National Wood for \$35,000. Neither party accepted APCO's offer.

Preliminarily, APCO's offers were timely.¹¹ Helix and National Wood argued that the November 13, 2018 offers of judgment were untimely because (i) in 2012 the Court (per Judge Susan Scann) issued an Order, which was prepared and submitted by and at the behest of APCO, by and through its then-attorneys, that "[t]rial of this consolidated matter commenced on October 30, 2012," and (ii) this action has never been bifurcated or de-consolidated. However, the Court

²⁴ Dillard Dep't Stores, Inc. v. Beckwith, 115 Nev. 372, 382, 989 P.2d 882, 888 (1999).

⁶ Bergmann v. Boyce, 109 Nev. 670, 678, 856 P.2d 560, 565 (1993).

⁷ Beattie v. Thomas, 99 Nev. 579, 588-89, 668 P.2d 268, 274 (1983)

⁸ Beattie v. Thomas, 99 Nev. 579, 588-89, 668 P.2d 268, 274 (1983)

⁹ Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Co. v. Mercer, 111 Nev.

^{318, 324, 890} P.2d 785, 789 (1995), superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in RTTC

Comme'ns, LLC v. Saratoga Flier, Inc., 121 Nev. 34, 41-42 & n. 20, 110 P.3d 24, 29 & n. 20 (2005).

¹⁰ Arnoult, 114 Nev. at 252 n. 16, 955 P.2d at 673 n. 16.

¹¹ Allianz Ins. Co. v. Gagnon, 109 Nev. 990, 994-95, 860 P.2d 720, 724 (1993).

is persuaded by APCO's contention that its offers of judgment were timely relative to the applicability of NRCP 68 and *Allianz Ins. Co. v. Gagnon*, 109 Nev. 990, 994-95, 860 P.2d 720, 724 (1993).

The Court assesses the Beattie factors as follows:

- Helix's and National Wood's (CabineTec's) claims were brought in good faith.
- APCO's offers were reasonable and in good faith in both timing and amount.
- Helix's and National Wood's decisions to reject the offers and proceed to trial against
 APCO were not grossly unreasonable or in bad faith.
- The fees sought by APCO are reasonable, ¹² Brunzell v. Golden Gate Nat'l Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969), but an order that Helix and National Wood pay them in their entirety would not be justified given the balancing of the Beattie factors.

Accordingly, APCO's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs is GRANTED pursuant to NRCP 68 with an award of attorneys' fees against Helix in the sum of \$85,000.00, and an award of attorneys' fees against National Wood in the sum of \$60,000.00.

APCO requested \$57,228.89 in costs, the Court GRANTS APCO's Motion for Costs and Memorandum for Costs subject to the following deductions: \$3,942.38 for travel and lodging, \$6,013.42 for photocopies¹³ and \$10,500 related to an accounting audit.¹⁴ In total, APCO is awarded a total of \$36,615.08 in costs; \$18,307.54 due from Helix and \$18,307.54 due from National Wood.

In total, APCO is awarded a total of \$103,307.54 in fees and costs against Helix and a total of \$78,307.54 in fees and costs against National Wood.

APCO's post-offer fees attributable to Helix total \$130,933.73 and APCO's post-offer fees attributable to National Wood total \$106,882.23.

¹³ Spencer Fane initially asked for \$15,013.42 for photocopies and reproductions for trial. With the \$6,013.42 deduction, APCO is awarded \$9,000 for photocopies and reproductions for trial.

¹⁴ For the sake of judicial efficiency, the Court incorporates APCO's briefing on its costs from its 05/26/2018 APCO Construction, Inc. 's Supplement to its of its Motion for Attorneys' Fees, APCO Construction, Inc. 06/29/2018 Reply in Support of its Motion for Attorney's Fees and related briefing.

2. Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc.'s Motion to Retax Costs Re: Defendant APCO Construction, Inc.'s Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements Against Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc. with Joinder by Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC

National Wood asserted various reasons for retaxing certain costs. National Wood's Motion to Retax is granted in part as follows: First, the Court retaxes and reduces \$3,942.38 of APCO's expenses related travel and lodging since these amounts were not incurred for depositions. Since only half of the total travel costs were initially allocated to National Wood, the Court retaxes and reduces the \$1,971.19 that APCO initially attributed to National Wood to \$0.00 (zero dollars). Next, the court retaxes \$6,013.42 of the \$15,013.42 APCO requested for photocopies and reduces the same to \$9,000.00. Again, because APCO only asked for half of the total \$15,013.42 in photocopies against National Wood, the Court retaxes and reduces these amounts as to National Wood to \$4,500.00

In total, APCO is awarded \$18,307.54 in costs against National Wood.

3. Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC's Motion to Retax Costs Re: Defendant APCO Construction, Inc.'s Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements with Joinder by Plaintiff in Intervention National Wood Products, Inc.

Helix's Motion to Retax Costs is also granted in part. First, Helix is entitled to the same deductions awarded to National Wood such that (i) the Court retaxes and reduces the \$1,971.19 that APCO initially attributed to Helix to \$0.00 (zero dollars) and (ii) the court retaxes \$6,013.42 of the \$15,013.42 APCO requested for photocopies and reduces Helix's portion of the same to \$4,500.00. In addition, the Court will retax \$10,500 of accounting costs.

APCO is awarded \$18,307.54 in costs against Helix.

1	Hear Motion for Order Permitting Leave to	File Surreply to APCO Construction's Reply	
2	to National Wood Products, Inc.'s Opposition to Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs.		
3	APCO did not oppose National Wood's Motion for Order Shortening Time to Hear		
4	Motion for Order Permitting Leave to File Surreply to APCO Construction's Reply to National		
5	Wood Products, Inc.'s Opposition to Motion for	Attorneys' Fees and Costs. As such, the Motion	
6	is granted.		
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
8	DATED this day of	, 2018.	
9			
10			
11		DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
12			
13	Respectfully submitted by:		
14	SPENCER FANE LLP		
15	By: Man Roch		
16	John H. Mowbray, E.R. (Bar No. 1140) John Randall Jefferies, Esq. (Bar No. 35 Mary E. Baken, Esq. (Bar No. 12686)	12)	
17	300 S. Fourth Street, Shite 950		
18	Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: (702) 408-3411		
19	Facsimile: (702) 408-3401 Attorneys for Apco Construction, Inc.		
20	Approved as to form by:		
21	RICHARDL, TOBLER, LTD.	DOWN DRIVERY	
22	RICHARDE, TOBLER, LID.	PEEL BRIMLEY	
23	By: Xeb	ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN,	
24	Richard L. Tobler, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 4070	Nevada Bar No. 9407 RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ.	
25	3654 N. Rancho Drive, Suite 102 Las Vegas, Nevada 89130	Nevada Bar No. 4359 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200	
26	Attorneys for Plaintiff in Intervention, NATIONAL WOOD PRODUCTS, INC.	Henderson, NV 89074-6571 Attorneys for Helix Electric of Nevada,	
27		LLC,	

1	Hear Motion for Order Permitting Leave to File Surreply to APCO Construction's Reply
2	to National Wood Products, Inc.'s Opposition to Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs.
3	APCO did not oppose National Wood's Motion for Order Shortening Time to Hear
4	Motion for Order Permitting Leave to File Surreply to APCO Construction's Reply to National
5	Wood Products, Inc.'s Opposition to Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs. As such, the Motion
6	is granted.
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	DATED this 25 day of Serlen 12, 2018.
9	
10	01701
11	DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
12	
13	Respectfully submitted by:
14	SPENCER FANE LLP
15	Ву:
16	John H. Mowbray, Esq. (Bar No. 1140) John Randall Jefferies, Esq. (Bar No. 3512)
17	Mary E. Bacon, Esq. (Bar No. 12686) 300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 950
18	Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: (702) 408-3411
19	Facsimile: (702) 408-3401 Attorneys for Apco Construction, Inc.
20	Approved as to form by:
21	RICHARD L. TOBLER, LTD. PEEL BRIMLEY
22	REEL BRIVELE
23	By: Richard I. Tobler Fso ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN,
24	Nevada Bar No. 4070 Nevada Bar No. 9407
25	Las Vegas, Nevada 89130 Nevada Bar No. 4359
26	Attorneys for Plaintiff in Intervention, NATIONAL WOOD PRODUCTS, INC. Henderson, NV 89074-6571 Attorneys for Helix Electric of Nevada,
27	LLC,

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2	APCO CONSTRUCTION, INC., A Case No. 77320		
3	NEVADA CORPORATION, District Court Case Mar 04 2019 11:β1 a.m.		
4	Cross Appellant/Respondent vs. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court Appeal from the Eighth Judicial		
5	HELIX ELECTRIC OF NEVADA, Denton LLC, District Court, the Honorable Mark Denton		
6	Cross Respondent/Appellant		
7			
8			
9	1. Eighth Judicial District Court, Department 13, Clark County, Judge Mark Denton, District Court Case No. A-571228.		
10	2. Attorney Filing this Docket Statement:		
11	John Randall Jefferies, Esq., Nevada Bar #3512 Christopher H. Byrd, Esq., Nevada Bar #1633		
11	Fennemore Craig, P.C.		
12	300 South Fourth St. 14 th Floor		
	Las Vegas, NV 89101		
13	Telephone: (702) 692-8000		
	Facsimile: (702) 692-8099		
14	Email: rjefferies@fclaw.com		
	<u>cbyrd@fclaw.com</u>		
15	-and-		
1.0	Mary E. Bacon, Esq., Nevada Bar # 12686		
16	Spencer Fane, LLP 300 South 4 th Street, Suite 950		
17	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101		
1 /	Telephone: (702) 408-3400		
18	Facsimile: (702) 408-3401		
	Email: mbacon@spencerfane.com		
19	-and-		

1		Micah S. Echols, Esq., Nevada Bar #84	37				
		Cody S. Mounteer, Esq., Nevada Bar #	11220				
2	Tom W. Stewart, Esq., Nevada Bar #14280 Marquis Aurbach Coffing						
3		10001 Park Run Drive					
		Las Vegas, NV 89145					
4		Telephone: (702) 382-0711					
		Facsimile: (702) 382-5816					
5	i.	Email: mechols@maclaw.com					
		cmounteer@maclaw.com					
6		tstewart@maclaw.com	I ARCO Company				
_		Attorneys for Cross Appellant/Respond	tent APCO Construction, Inc.				
7	2	Attauracy(s) Barracanting Cross Bosn	andont/Appallants				
8	3.	Attorney(s) Representing Cross Resp Eric B. Zimbelman, Esq., Nevada Bar #					
0		Peel Brimley LLP	77407				
9		3333 E. Serene Ave. Suite 200					
		Henderson, NV 89074					
10		Telephone: (702) 990-7272					
		Facsimile: (702) 990-7273					
11		E-mail: ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com					
		Attorney for Helix Electric of Nevada,					
12							
	4.	Nature of Disposition (check all that	apply):				
13		☐ Judgment after bench trial	☐ Dismissal:				
14		☐ Judgment after jury verdict	☐ Lack of jurisdiction				
		☐ Summary judgment	☐ Failure to state a claim				
15		☐ Default judgment	☐ Failure to prosecute				
16		☐ Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief	☐ Other (specify):				
		☐ Grant/Denial of injunction	☐ Divorce Decree:				
17		☐ Grant/Denial of declaratory relief	☐ Original ☐ Modification				
18		☐ Review of Agency determination	☐ Other disposition				
			eify): Post Judgment Special				
19		\ <u>-</u>	ing attorneys' fees and costs.				
	l						

1	5.	Does this appeal raise issues concerning any of the following? No.
2		☐ Child Custody
2		□ Venue
3		☐ Termination of parental rights
4	6.	Pending and prior proceedings in this court. List the case name and docket number of all appeals or original proceedings presently or
5		previously pending before this court which are related to this appeal: 1. Docket No. 75197, APCO Construction, Inc. v Zitting Bros.
6	1	Constr., Inc. 2. Docket No. 61131, APCO Construction, Inc. v. Dist. Ct. (Scott
7		Financial). 3. Docket No. 57641, Club Vista Financial Services v. Dist. Ct.
8		(Scott Financial). 4. Docket No. 57784, Club Vista Financial Services v. Dist. Ct.
9		 (Scott Financial). 5. Docket No. 76276, Helix Electric of NV, LLC, et. al. v APCO
10	*	Construction, Inc.
11	7.	Pending and prior proceedings in other courts: List the case name, number and court of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts
12		which are related to this appeal (e.g., bankruptcy, consolidated or bifurcated proceedings) and their dates of disposition:
13		APCO refers to and incorporates by reference Section 7 of Helix ric of Nevada, LLC's Docketing Statement and referenced pleadings,
14	filed	August 8, 2018, in Docket No 76276.
15	8.	Nature of the action. Briefly describe the nature of the action and the result below:
16	Elec	APCO refers to and incorporates by reference Section 8 of Helix tric of Nevada, LLC's Docketing Statement and referenced pleadings,
17		August 8, 2018, in Docket No 76276. APCO further states that this Cross Appeal is to appeal post trial
18		rs denying APCO attorneys' fees pursuant to the relevant contract ments and refusing to award APCO all of its costs.
19		
l l	I	

1 2	9.	Issues on appeal. State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appear (attach separate sheets as necessary): 1. Whether the District Court erred in failing to determine APCO	
3		was entitled to attorneys' fees under relevant subcontract provisions governing the award of attorneys' fees? and	
4		2. Whether the District Court erred in failing to award APCO all of its recoverable costs?	
5	10.	Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues. If you are aware of any proceeding presently pending before	
6		this court which raises the same or similar issues raised in this appeal, list the case name and docket number and identify the same or similar	
7		issues raised: 1. Helix Electric of Nevada LLC and National Wood Products,	
8		1. Helix Electric of Nevada LLC and National Wood Products, Inc. v. APCO Construction Inc., Docket No. 76276. Helix Electric amended its notice of appeal to appeal the same award of fees and	
9		costs to APCO that are at issue in this appeal.	
10	11.	Constitutional issues: If this appeal challenges the constitutionality of a statute, and the state, any state agency, or any officer or	
11		employee thereof is not a party to this appeal, have you notified the clerk of this court and the attorney general in accordance with NRAP	
12		44 and NRS 30.130? □ N/A	
13		□ Yes	
		□ No	
14	-	If not, explain:	
15	12.	Other issues. Does this appeal involve any of the following issues? ☐ Reversal of well-settled Nevada precedent (identify the case(s))	
16		☐ An issue arising under the United States and/or Nevada	
17		Constitutions ☐ A substantial issue of first-impression	
		☐ An issue of public policy	
18		An issue where en banc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of this court's decisions	
19		☐ A ballot question	

If so, explain:

The issue is whether equity bars a party to a contract that has an attorneys' fee provision from avoiding liability for fees on claims arising from the contract unsuccessfully asserted the assignor of the contract. APCO's award of full fees pursuant to the relevant subcontract was denied because Helix argued APCO could not collect fees under the subcontract since APCO assigned the subcontract to the replacement contractor and thus, was not a party to the contract. APCO argued its fees were permitted pursuant to equitable estoppel because Helix's claims were all contract based and Helix would have been entitled to its fees had it prevailed.

13. Assignment to the Court of Appeals or retention in the Supreme Court. Briefly set forth whether the matter is presumptively retained by the Supreme Court or assigned to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, and cite the subparagraph(s) of the Rule under which the matter falls. If appellant believes that the Supreme Court should retain the case despite its presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals, identify the specific issue(s) or circumstance(s) that warrant retaining the case, and include an explanation of their importance or significance:

The issue regarding the award of fees and costs in a post judgment motion requires that these issues be assigned presumptively to the Court of Appeals. NRAP 17(b)(7). However, APCO believes the Supreme Court should retain this case because it provides an issue of public policy. The issue is whether equity bars a party to a contract that has an attorneys' fee provision from avoiding liability for fees on claims arising from the contract unsuccessfully asserted the assignor of the contract. APCO's award of full fees pursuant to the relevant subcontract was denied because Helix argued APCO could not collect fees under the subcontract since APCO assigned the subcontract to the replacement contractor and thus, was not a party to the contract. APCO argued its fees were permitted pursuant to equitable estoppel because Helix's claims were all contract based and Helix would have been entitled to its fees had it prevailed.

14. Trial. If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial

- 1					
1		last?			
2		The issues on this appeal arise from post judgment motions for attorneys' fees and costs.			
3		Was it a bench or jury trial? The underlying action was a six day bench trial.			
4					
5	15.	Judicial Disqualification. Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from participation in this appeal? If so, which Justice?			
6					
7		No			
8		TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL			
9	16.	Date of entry of written judgment or order appealed from September 28, 2018.			
10		Attach a copy. If more than one judgment or order is appealed from, attach copies of each judgment or order from which appeal			
11		is taken. See Exhibit "1".			
12 13	×.	(a) If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review:			
14		N/A			
	17.	Date written notice of entry of judgment or order was served:			
15		September 28, 2018.			
16		Was service by:			
17		☐ Delivery ☐ Unknown ☐ Mail/Electronic/Fax.			
18	18.	If the time for filing the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion (NRCP 50(b), 52(b), or 59). N/A.			
19		(a) Specify the type of motion, the date and method of service of			

1		tŀ	ne motion, and the d	ate of filing. N/A.
2			NRCP 50(b)	Date of Filing
3			NRCP 52(b)	Date of Filing:
			NRCP 59	Date of Filing:
5		re	ehearing or reconsid	e pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for eration may toll the time for filing a notice of Builders v Washington, 126 Nev,
6		22	45 P.3d 1190 (2010)	
7		(b)	Date of entry of w	ritten order resolving tolling motion
8		(c) W	Date written notice was served	e of entry of order resolving tolling motion
9		V	Vas service by:	
10			Delivery	
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$] Mail	
	19.	4 90	notice of appeal w	
12 13		(a)	order, list date eac	e party has appealed from the judgment or ch notice of appeal was filed and identify by ng the notice of appeal:
14	Elec		O filed its Notice of	of Cross Appeal on October 26, 2018. Helix nended Notice of Appeal was filed in Docket
15	7627	76 on	October 25, 2018.	
16	20.	1	eify statute or rule ce of appeal, e.g., N	e governing the time limit for filing the $(RAPA(a))$ or other
17		NRA	$\Delta P 4(a)(2)$. This cross	ss appeal was filed within 14 days after Helix 's Amended Notice of Appeal, which
18		100	aled the District Conneys' fees and costs	urt's decision of the post judgment orders for .
19				

SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY

2			ther authority granting this court
3	յս	irisdiction to review the ju	dgment or order appealed from:
4	(a)	\square NRAP 3A(b)(2)	□ NRS 233B.150
5		` 1	P 3A(b)(7)post judgment special order
6		after judgment for attor	neys' fees and costs.
7	(b	from the judgment or	
8	Post judgment orders involving attorneys' fees and costs are special orders after final judgment. Smith v. Crown Financial Services, 111 New 227, 280 n. 2, 890 P.2d 769, 771 n.2 (1995).		
9	227, 200	7 II. 2, 650 I .2 u 705, 77 I II.2	. (1999).
10		ist all parties involved in the district court:	he action or consolidated actions in
11	(a		g case was a consolidated case involving refers to and incorporates by reference
12 13	Section 22 of Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC's Docketing Statement and the referenced Consolidated Case List (Exhibit "B") attached thereto, filed August 8, 2018, in Docket No 76276.		
14	(b) explain		strict court are not parties to this appeal, s are not involved in this appeal, e.g.,
15	formally	dismissed, not served, or o	ther:
16			ates by reference Sections 7 and 22(b) of Docketing Statement and referenced
17		gs, filed August 8, 2018, in I	
18	///		
19	///		
1			

1	l				
1	23.	Give	a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate s, counterclaims, cross-claims or third-party claims, and the		
2	date of formal disposition of each claim.				
3	APCO contends that it was entitled to attorneys' fees under the terms of the relevant subcontracts, NRS 108.237(3) and NRCP 68 and costs pursuant to the Judgment as prevailing party and the Verified Cost Memorandum filed below.				
4					
5	All issues regarding attorneys' fees and costs were resolved by the Order, written notice of which was given September 28, 2018.				
6					
7	As to the claims in the underlying action, APCO refers to and incorporates by reference Section 7 and 22(b) of Helix Electric of Nevada's Docketing Statement and the referenced pleadings, filed August 8, 2018, in				
8	Docket No 76276.				
9	24. Did the judgment or order appealed from adjudicate ALL the claims alleged below and the rights and liabilities of ALL the				
10		parti	es to the action or consolidated actions below?		
11			Yes		
12			No		
13	25.	(a)	specify the claims remaining pending below: Specify the parties remaining below:		
14		(b) (c) from	Did the district court certify the judgment or order appealed as a final judgment pursuant to NRCP 54(b)?		
15			Yes		
16			No		
17		(d)	Did the district court make an express determination, pursuant to NRCP 54(b), that there is no just reason for delay and an express direction for the entry of judgment?		
18		П	Yes		
19			No		
		and the second			

- 26. If you answered "No" to any part of question 24, explain the basis for seeking appellate review (e.g., order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)): N/A
 - 27. Attached file-stamped copies of the following documents: The latest-filed complaint, counterclaims, cross-claims, and third-party claims; any tolling motion(s) and order(s) resolving tolling motion(s); orders of NRCP 41(a) dismissals formally resolving each claim, counterclaims, cross-claims and/or third-party claims asserted in the action or consolidated action below, even if not at issue on appeal; any other order challenged on appeal; and notices of entry for each attached order.

See Exhibit "1". For the pleadings related to the underlying action, APCO refers to and incorporates by reference the Appendix filed by APCO in its Docketing Statement in Case No. 75197, filed April 3, 2018, and Exhibits "1", and "C" through "I" to Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC's Docketing Statement, filed August 8, 2018, in Docket No 76276.

VERIFICATION

2	I declare under penalty	of perjury that I have read this docketing			
3	statement, that the information provided in this docketing statement is tru				
4	and complete to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that				
5	have attached all required documents to this docketing statement.				
6	Name of Appellant/Cross-	Name of counsel of record:			
7	Respondent	John Randall Jefferies, Esq., NV Bar #3512			
8	APCO Construction, Inc.	Christopher H. Byrd, Esq. Fennemore Craig, P.C.			
9		300 South Fourth St. 14 th Floor Las Vegas, NV 89101			
10		Telephone: (702) 692-8000 Facsimile: (702) 692-8099			
11		Email: rjefferies@fclaw.com cbyrd@fclaw.com			
12		-and- Mary E. Bacon, Esq., NV Bar # 12686			
13		Spencer Fane, LLP 300 South 4 th Street, Suite 950			
14		Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 408-3400			
15		Facsimile: (702) 408-3401 Email: mbacon@spencerfane.com			
16		-and- Micah S. Echols, Esq., NV Bar #8437			
17		Cody S. Mounteer, Esq., NV Bar #11220 Tom W. Stewart, Esq., NV Bar #14280			
18		Marquis Aurbach Coffing 10001 Park Run Drive			
19		Las Vegas, NV 89145 Telephone: (702) 382-0711			

ĺ	
1	Facsimile: (702) 382-5816 Email: <u>mechols@maclaw.com</u>
2	cmounteer@maclaw.com tstewart@maclaw.com
3	Dated this 29th day of
4	January, 2019. Mustophe A. Sign
5	Signature of counsel of record State and county where
6	signed: Clark County, Nevada
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2	I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the		
3	Nevada Supreme Court on the 29th day of January, 2019 and was serve		
4	electronically in accordance with the Master Service List and via the United		
5	States Mail, first class, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:		
6	PEEL BRIMLEY LLP	MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING	
7	Eric B. Zimbelman	Micah S. Echols	
8	(ezembelman@peelbrimley.com) Richard L. Peel	(mechols@macklaw.com) Cody S. Mounteer	
9	(rpeel@peelbrimley.com)	(cmounteer@macklaw.co) Tom W. Stewart	
10		(tstewart@maclaw.com)	
11	I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a		
12	true and correct copy thereof, postage prepaid, addressed to:		
13	/s/	Trista Day	
14	Ar	n employee of Fennemore Craig P.C.	
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
	9		