IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANTHONY JACOB MONAHAN,

Appellant,

Case No. 78489

 $\|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{s}}\|$

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

AMANDA KAITLYN HOGAN fka AMANDA KAITLYN KING, FILED

APR 17 2019

Respondent.



RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DISMISS CASE

Aaron Bushur, Esq.

NV Bar No. 10862

316 California Ave., #256

Reno, Nevada 89509

(775) 219-4222

Aaronbushurlaw@yahoo.com

Attorney for Appellant



19-16918

Response to Motion to Dismiss

Appellant hereby opposes Respondent's April 8, 2019 Motion to Dismiss Appeal based upon the following Points and Authorities:

Introduction

The Parties are involved in a custody case involving one (1) minor child, Malakai Jaco Monahan (DOB: 7-18-12). The October 26, 2015 District Court Order granted the Parties joint legal and physical custody of the child. On August 29, 2018 Respondent filed her Motion to Modify Custody and an evidentiary hearing was held before the District Court on December 27, 2018. Following that hearing the District Court ordered the Parties to file supplemental briefs regarding each Party's position and after review of those briefs, the Court entered its Order on March 1, 2019. This is the Order currently at issue. On that same date, the Court filed its Notice of Entry of Order. This appeal was initiated on March 29, 2019. Appellant contends that the March 1, 2019 Order was a final order for purposes of appeal based upon the following law and argument.

Law

Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 3A states in pertinent part as follows:

RULE 3A. CIVIL ACTIONS: STANDING TO APPEAL; APPEALABLE DETERMINATIONS

(a) Standing to Appeal. A party who is aggrieved by an appealable judgment or order may appeal from that judgment or order, with or without first moving for a new trial.

19.

- **(b) Appealable Determinations.** An appeal may be taken from the following judgments and orders of a district court in a civil action:
- (1) A final judgment entered in an action or proceeding commenced in the court in which the judgment is rendered.

(2-6) **(omitted)**

(7) An order entered in a proceeding that did not arise in a juvenile court that finally establishes or alters the custody of minor children.

(8-10) (omitted)

Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 4 states in pertinent part as follows:

RULE 4. APPEAL — WHEN TAKEN

(a) Appeals in Civil Cases.

- (1) Time and Location for Filing a Notice of Appeal. In a civil case in which an appeal is permitted by law from a district court, the notice of appeal required by Rule 3 shall be filed with the district court clerk. Except as provided in Rule 4(a)(4), a notice of appeal must be filed after entry of a written judgment or order, and no later than 30 days after the date that written notice of entry of the judgment or order appealed from is served. If an applicable statute provides that a notice of appeal must be filed within a different time period, the notice of appeal required by these Rules must be filed within the time period established by the statute.
 - (2) (omitted)
- (3) Entry Defined. A judgment or order is entered for purposes of this Rule when it is signed by the judge or by the clerk, as the case may be, and filed with the clerk. A notice or stipulation of dismissal filed under NRCP 41(a)(1) has the same effect as a judgment or order signed by the judge and filed by the clerk and constitutes entry of a judgment or order for purposes of this Rule. If that notice or stipulation dismisses all unresolved claims pending in an action in the district court, the notice or stipulation constitutes entry of a final judgment or order for purposes of this Rule.
 - (4-7) (omitted)
 - (b-f) (omitted)

Zugel by Zugel v. Miller, 99 Nev. 100, 101, 659 P.2d 296 (1983) states "Filing a timely notice of appeal is jurisdictional and an ultimately appeal may not be considered." Citing Morrell v. Edwards, 98 Nev. 91, 640 P.2d 1322 (1982). The Court further stated "Under NRAP 4(a), the timely filing of notice of appeal begins to run upon service of written notice of entry of judgment." Id.

In Healy v. Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft, 103 Nev. 329,331 741 P.2d 432, 433 (1987), the Supreme Court of Nevada stated NRAP 4(a) requires that notice of appeal in a civil case "shall be filed... within thirty (30) days of the date of service of written notice of entry of judgment or order appealed from." In that case the Court found that Appellants filed their appeal seven (7) days beyond the time allowed and their untimely notice failed to evoke the Court's jurisdiction for appeal. <u>Id</u>.

Argument

Appellant contends that he filed his Notice of Appeal within the thirty (30) days allowed pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellant Procedure 4(a)(1) and within thirty (30) days of the March 1, 2019 Notice of Entry of Order. This rule states "...a notice of appeal must be filed after entry of a written judgment or order, and no later than 30 days after the date that written notice of entry of the judgment or order appealed from is served." In this case the District Court filed its Notice of Entry of Order on March 1, 2019 which Appellant argues serves no other purpose other than to notice the Parties

25

26

27

28

that a final order has been entered and which then causes the time for either Party to file a timely appeal to run with the period concluding thirty (30) days later. Appellant admits that the District Court's March 1, 2019 Order did not appear to fully resolve all issues presented. Appellant admitted such in his March 29, 2019 Case Appeal Statement although it remained unknown as to if the District Court would be readdressing the issues at a later date or if the March 1, 2019 Order would stand. Based upon the limited Order provisions found on page 9 of the District Court's March 1, 2019 Order, it is not clear as to if this was meant to be a final order or if additional Orders and/or hearings would be held. Of most concern was the fact that the Court filed its Notice of Entry of Order on March 1, 2019 in conjunction with the underlying Order which was/is believed to be for the sole purpose of initiating the time allowed for appeal of the Order. Appellant was forced to file his underlying appeal as a means of securing his right to do so whether the March 1, 2019 Order was in fact a final or intermediate order. Appellant continues to believe the Order is a final order as no additional hearing has been scheduled on these issues and no movement towards a custody schedule/exchange has been made.

The above provided case law supports Appellant's contention that appeal of the District Court case is and was appropriate. In <u>Zugel by Zugel v. Miller</u>, 99 Nev. 100, 101, 659 P.2d 296 (1983) the Supreme Court of Nevada stated "Under NRAP 4(a), the timely filing of notice of appeal begins to run upon service of written notice of entry of

judgment." Id. As is argued elsewhere in this Response, the District Court entering its Notice of Entry of Order gave Appellant notice that the Order had been entered and serves no other reasonable purpose than to notice the Parties of entry and of their time to appeal. Had the District Court not entered a Notice of Entry of Order perhaps there is some room for argument that the March 1, 2019 Order was not intended to be or was not a final order but when a District Court notices Parties that an order has been entered for no other reasonable reason other than to have their appeal period to begin, Appellant was correct to believe the March 1, 2019 Order to be a final order. As of the date of this Response, it remains unknown as to if the March 1, 2019 Order was in fact a final order for the purposes of appeal or if the Court will or intends to enter future orders relating to these same issues.

In Healy v. Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft, 103 Nev. 329,331 741 P.2d 432, 433 (1987), stated NRAP 4(a) requires that notice of appeal in a civil case "shall be filed... within thirty (30) days of the date of service of written notice of entry of judgment or order appealed from." As with the case law and argument in the previous paragraph, Healy likewise supports Appellant's contention, and possibly the District Court's contention that the March 1, 2019 Order was intended to be its final order for appeal purposes. Healy also states that an appeal must be filed within thirty (30) days of the date a notice of entry of order is served. Review of Healy indicates that the simple filing of a notice of entry of order has the purpose of notifying litigants that the

thirty (30) day period in which to appeal has begun. No other reason exists for a court filing such a notice.

Further, Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 3A, as is included above, supports Appellant's March 29, 2019 Notice of Appeal. Nevada Rule of Appellant Procedure 3A(b)(7) states that appeals may be taken based upon District Court orders when "An order entered in a proceeding that did not arise in a juvenile court that finally establishes or alters the custody of minor children." The order in question in this case, the March 1, 2019 Order finally establishes and orders the custody of the Parties' minor child. In that Order the Court effectively granted Respondent primary physical custody, found that she did not need to seek permission to relocate although she did meet her burden to relocate and ordered that the child would finish the school year at his current school. The only unresolved issue was a visitation schedule which the Parties were directed to meet and confer on. Based upon the wording of the District Court Order, if the Parties were unable to do so a hearing could be held to determine that issue but the Order failed to require any additional action by the Parties if they were in fact able to reach a visitation agreement. These issues along with the above detailed fact that the Court entered a Notice of Entry of Order leads Appellant to believe the March 1, 2019 Order was in fact a "final order" for appellant purposes and his appeal of that order is and was necessary to secure his appellant rights. Had Appellant not filed his current appeal it

could be argued that he waived his right to appeal any provisions and/or issues contained within the March 1, 2019 Order.

Based upon the wording contained within the District Court's March 1, 2019 Order as well as the above law and argument, Appellant argues that the Order in question is in fact a final order. In the event that Order is determined to not be a final order and the appeal is therefore dismissed, Appellant suggests that Respondent's request for attorney's fees and costs associated with the filing of her Motion to Dismiss Appeal be denied as Appellant had reasonable belief that the Order in question was a final order and therefore appealable based upon the imprecise language contained within it as well as the associated actions taken in the District Court.

Additionally, undersigned counsel wishes to point out that pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellant Procedure 27(a)(3)(a), "Any party may file a response to a motion; Rule 27(a)(2) governs its contents. The response must be filed within 7 days after service of the motion unless the court shortens or extends the time." It should be noted that Respondent's April 8, 2019 Motion to Dismiss states in its attached Certificate of Service that undersigned counsel was served with a copy on April 8, 2019 through both electronic mail and E-flex although undersigned counsel was not in fact served through electronic mail until April 9, 2019. See Exhibit "1". Additionally, the file stamp states the Motion was filed on April 9, 2019. Undersigned counsel likewise has not received any notice through E-flex as of the date of this Response as it is believed undersigned

is not signed up to receive such notice. Appellant provided this information solely as means of pointing out that this Response is timely filed pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellant Procedure 27(a)(2).

This document does not contain the Social Security Number of any person.

Dated this 16th day of April 2019.

Aaron Bushur, Esq.
Bar No. 10862
316 California Ave., #256
Reno, Nevada 89509
775-219-4222
Attorney for Appellant Anthony Monahan

Certificate of Compliance

- 1. I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because:
- [X] This brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in 14 point font, Times New Roman style or
- [] This brief has been prepared in a monospaced typeface using [state name and version of word-processing program] with [state number of characters per inch and name of type style].
- 2. I further certify that this brief complies with the page- or type-volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by NRAP 32(a)(7)(C), it is either:
- [] Proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more, and contains ______ words; or
- [] Monospaced, has 10.5 or fewer characters per inch, and contains _____ words or ____ lines of text; or
 - [X] Does not exceed 10 pages.
- 3. Finally, I hereby certify that I have read this appellate brief, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any

improper purpose. I further certify that this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e)(1), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by a reference to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where the matter relied on is to be found. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Dated this 16th day of April 2019.

Aaron Bushur, Esq. NV Bar No. 10862 316 California Ave., #256 Reno, Nevada 89509 (775) 219-4222 Attorney for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am a resident of the State of Nevada, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is AARON BUSHUR, ESQ, 316 California Ave., #256, Reno, Nevada 89509. On the 16th day of April 2019, I served the within document(s) through the U.S. Mail to:

Roderic A. Carucci, Esq. Kelly A. VandeBurgt, Esq. 702 Plumas Street Reno, Nevada 89509

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada that the above is true and correct.

Executed on the 16th day of April 2019 in Sparks, Nevada.

Signature

. -

Exhibit "1"

Exhibit "1"

Monahan/Hogan

From: Bryttanie McNeff (bryt@nvlitigators.com)

aaronbushurlaw@yahoo.com To:

Cc: rod@nvlitigators.com; kelly@nvlitigators.com; clarissa@nvlitigators.com

Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019, 04:37 PM PDT

Aaron, please see the attached motion to dismiss.

Bryttanie McNeff Carucci & Associates Attorneys at Law 702 Plumas Street Reno, Nevada 89509

Phone: 775-323-0400 Fax: 775-323-0466

Toll Free: 844-79-NVLAW

Licensed in Nevada, Colorado, Oregon and Washington Offices in Reno, Fernley, Fallon, Winnemucca



201904091626-2.pdf 76.6kB



201904091626-1.pdf 1M8



201904091626.pdf

1.8MB