

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GREENMART OF NEVADA NLV LLC,
a Nevada limited liability company,

Appellant,

vs.

HIGH SIERRA HOLISTICS LLC; and
THE STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION,

Respondents.

Electronically Filed
May 04 2020 02:40 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

SUPREME COURT CASE NO:
79672

DISTRICT COURT CASE NO.:
A787726

**APPELLANT GREENMART OF NEVADA NLV, LLC'S RESPONSE TO
SECOND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

On April 3, 2020, this Court entered an Order to Show cause directing Appellant GreenMart of Nevada NLV, LLC ("GreenMart") to show cause why this Court should not dismiss case numbers 79670, 79671, 79672, and 79673 for lack of jurisdiction. Upon review of the district court record in this matter, it appears that this Court does not have jurisdiction over the above-listed appeals.

The subject of all of the appeals mentioned in the April 3, 2020 Order to Show Cause is an August 23, 2019 Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Granting Preliminary Injunction entered by the district court. On February 7, 2020, the district court entered an Amended Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Granting Preliminary Injunction ("Amended FFCL"). (*See* Addendum 1.) In the Amended

FFCL, the Court noted that it was amending the findings to “reflect findings made and conclusions reached in the two cases” that were assigned to the district court at the conclusion of the preliminary injunction evidentiary hearing—namely, *Serenity Wellness Center, LLC, et al. v. State of Nevada, Department of Taxation*, Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A-19-78692-B, and *ETW Management Group LLC, et al. v. State of Nevada, Department of Taxation*, Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A-19-787004-B. (Addendum 1, p. 1 at n.1.) The district court further noted that while other district court cases raising similar legal claims were coordinated for the purposes of hearing, “*a separate order was not entered in those cases as the cases were not assigned to the department for all purposes.*” (*Id.*) (emphasis added). Thus, the Amended FFCL is only effective—and therefore only appealable—as to those two cases.

Accordingly, GreenMart does not oppose dismissal of this appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted this the 4th day of May, 2020.

/s/ Alina M. Shell

Margaret A. McLetchie, Nevada Bar No. 10931

Alina M. Shell, Nevada Bar No. 11711

MCLETCHIE LAW

701 East Bridger Ave., Suite 520

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Telephone: (702) 728-5300

Fax: (702) 425-8220

Email: maggie@nvlitigation.com

Counsel for Appellant, GreenMart of Nevada NLV LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that the foregoing APPELLANT GREENMART OF NEVADA NLV, LLC'S RESPONSE TO SECOND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on the 4th day of May, 2020. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

Michael R. Ayers, James W. Puzey, and Clark V. Vellis
Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Puzey, Stein, Thompson
Counsel for Respondent,
High Sierra Holistics LLC

Ketan D. Bhirud, Aaron D. Ford, Theresa M. Haar, David J. Pope, and Steven G. Shevorski
Office of the Attorney General
Counsel for Respondent,
The State of Nevada Department of Taxation

/s/ Pharan Burchfield
Employee of McLetchie Law

ADDENDUM 1



FFCL

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Case No. A-19-786962-B and A-19-787004-B
Dept. No. 11

and Coordinated for a Limited Purpose With
A785818, A786357, A787540 and A787726

AMENDED¹
FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW GRANTING
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

ETW MANAGEMENT GROUP LLC, a
Nevada limited liability company; GLOBAL
HARMONY LLC, a Nevada limited liability
company; GREEN LEAF FARMS HOLDINGS
LLC, a Nevada limited liability company;
GREEN THERAPEUTICS LLC, a Nevada
limited liability company; HERBAL CHOICE
INC., a Nevada corporation; JUST QUALITY,
LLC, a Nevada limited liability company;
LIBRA WELLNESS CENTER, LLC, a Nevada
limited liability company; ROMBOUGH REAL
ESTATE INC. dba MOTHER HERB, a Nevada
corporation; NEVCANN LLC, a Nevada limited
liability company; RED EARTH LLC, a Nevada
limited liability company; THC NEVADA LLC,
a Nevada limited liability company; ZION
GARDENS LLC, a Nevada limited liability
company; and MMOF Vegas Retail, Inc., a
Nevada corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF
TAXATION, a Nevada administrative agency;
DOES 1 through 20, inclusive; and ROE
CORPORATIONS 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

AND

¹ These findings are amended to reflect findings made and conclusions reached in the two cases assigned to Dept. XI at the time of the conclusion of the preliminary injunction evidentiary hearing. The Court's order of July 11, 2019 coordinated A785818, A786357, A787540 and A 787726 for a limited purpose of the then ongoing preliminary injunction hearing but a separate order was not entered in those cases as the cases were not assigned to this department for all purposes. As discussed during the hearing on the Motion to Amend on February 7, 2020 and in conjunction with the orders to show cause issued by the Nevada Supreme Court in Case No. 79669, the Court does not address the retroactive effect, if any, of the consolidation entered by the Chief Judge by order filed on or about December 6, 2019.

SERENITY WELLNESS CENTER, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, TGIG, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, NULEAF INCLINE DISPENSARY, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, NEVADA HOLISTIC MEDICINE, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, TRYKE COMPANIES SO NV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, TRYKE COMPANIES RENO, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, PARADISE WELLNESS CENTER, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, GBS NEVADA PARTNERS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, FIDELIS HOLDINGS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, GRAVITAS NEVADA, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, NEVADA PURE, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, MEDIFARM, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, DOE PLAINTIFFS I through X; and ROE ENTITY PLAINTIFFS I through X,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION,

Defendant(s).

and

NEVADA ORGANIC REMEDIES, LLC; INTEGRAL ASSOCIATES LLC d/b/a ESSENCE CANNABIS DISPENSARIES, a Nevada limited liability company; ESSENCE TROPICANA, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; ESSENCE HENDERSON, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; CPCMHOLDINGS, LLC d/b/a THRIVE CANNABIS MARKETPLACE, COMMERCE PARK MEDICAL, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; and CHEYENNE MEDICAL, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; LONE MOUNTAIN PARTNERS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability partnership; HELPING HANDS WELLNESS CENTER, INC., a Nevada corporation; GREENMART OF NEVADA NLV LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; and CLEAR RIVER, LLC,

Intervenors.

1 This matter having come before the Court for an evidentiary hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for
2 Preliminary Injunction beginning on May 24, 2019, and occurring day to day thereafter until its
3 completion on August 16, 2019;² Dominic P. Gentile, Esq., Vincent Savarese III, Esq., Michael V.
4 Cristalli, Esq., and Ross J. Miller, Esq., of the law firm Gentile Cristalli Miller Armeni Savarese,
5 appeared on behalf of Serenity Wellness Center, LLC, TGIG, LLC, Nuleaf Incline Dispensary, LLC,
6 Nevada Holistic Medicine, LLC, Tryke Companies SO NV, LLC, Tryke Companies Reno, LLC,
7 Paradise Wellness Center, LLC, GBS Nevada Partners, LLC, Fidelis Holdings, LLC, Gravitas Nevada,
8 LLC, Nevada Pure, LLC, Medifarm, LLC (Case No. A786962-B) (the "Serenity Plaintiffs"); Adam K.
9 Bult, Esq. and Maximilien D. Fetaz, Esq., of the law firm Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP,
10 appeared on behalf of Plaintiffs ETW Management Group LLC, Global Harmony LLC, Green Leaf
11 Farms Holdings LLC, Green Therapeutics LLC, Herbal Choice INC., Just Quality, LLC, Libra
12 Wellness Center, LLC, Rombough Real Estate Inc. dba Mother Herb, NevCann LLC, Red Earth LLC,
13 THC Nevada LLC, Zion Gardens LLC, and MMOF Vegas Retail, Inc. (Case No. A787004-B) (the
14 "ETW Plaintiffs"); William S. Kemp, Esq. and Nathaniel R. Rulis, Esq., of the law firm Kemp, Jones
15 & Coulthard LLP, appeared on behalf of MM Development Company, Inc. and LivFree Wellness LLC
16 (Case No. A785818-W) (the "MM Plaintiffs"); Theodore Parker III, Esq., of the law firm Parker
17 Nelson & Associates, appeared on behalf of Nevada Wellness Center (Case No. A787540-W)
18 (collectively the "Plaintiffs"); Steven G. Shevorski, Esq., Ketan D. Bhirud, Esq., and Theresa M. Haar,
19 Esq., of the Office of the Nevada Attorney General, appeared on behalf of the State of Nevada,
20 Department of Taxation; David R. Koch, Esq., of the law firm Koch & Scow LLC, appeared on behalf
21 of Nevada Organic Remedies, LLC; Brigid M. Higgins, Esq. and Rusty Graf, Esq., of the law firm
22 Black & Lobello, appeared on behalf of Clear River, LLC; Eric D. Hone, Esq., of the law firm H1 Law
23 Group, appeared on behalf of Lone Mountain Partners, LLC; Alina M. Shell, Esq., of the law firm
24 McLetchie Law, appeared on behalf of GreenMart of Nevada NLV LLC; Jared Kahn, Esq., of the law

25
26 ² Although a preservation order was entered on December 13, 2018, in A785818, no discovery in any case was done
27 prior to the commencement of the evidentiary hearing, in part due to procedural issues and to statutory restrictions on
28 disclosure of certain information modified by SB 32 just a few days before the commencement of the hearing. As a result,
the hearing was much longer than anticipated by any of the participating counsel. In compliance with SB 32, the State
produced previously confidential information on May 21, 2019. These documents were reviewed for confidentiality by the
Defendants in Intervention and certain redactions were made prior to production consistent with the protective order entered
on May 24, 2019.

1 firm JK Legal & Consulting, LLC, appeared on behalf of Helping Hands Wellness Center, Inc.; and
2 Joseph A. Gutierrez, Esq., of the law firm Maier Gutierrez & Associates, and Philip M. Hymanson,
3 Esq., of the law firm Hymanson & Hymanson; Todd Bice, Esq. and Jordan T. Smith, Esq. of the law
4 firm Pisanelli Bice; and Dennis Prince, Esq. of the Prince Law Group appeared on behalf of Integral
5 Associates LLC d/b/a Essence Cannabis Dispensaries, Essence Tropicana, LLC, Essence Henderson,
6 LLC, CPCM Holdings, LLC d/b/a Thrive Cannabis Marketplace, Commerce Park Medical, LLC, and
7 Cheyenne Medical, LLC (the “Essence/Thrive Entities”). The Court, having read and considered the
8 pleadings filed by the parties; having reviewed the evidence admitted during the evidentiary hearing;
9 and having heard and carefully considered the testimony of the witnesses called to testify; having
10 considered the oral and written arguments of counsel, and with the intent of deciding the Motion for a
11 Preliminary Injunction,³ makes the following preliminary findings of fact and conclusions of law:

12 ***PROCEDURAL POSTURE***

13 Plaintiffs are a group of unrelated commercial entities who applied for, but did not receive,
14 licenses to operate retail recreational marijuana establishments in various local jurisdictions throughout
15 the state. Defendant is Nevada’s Department of Taxation (“DoT”), which is the administrative agency
16 responsible for issuing the licenses. Some successful applicants for licensure intervened as Defendants.

17 The Serenity Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction on March 19, 2019, asking for
18 a preliminary injunction to:

- 19 a. Enjoin the denial of Plaintiffs applications;
- 20 b. Enjoin the enforcement of the licenses granted;
- 21 c. Enjoin the enforcement and implementation of NAC 453D;
- 22 d. An order restoring the *status quo ante* prior to the DoT’s adoption of NAC 453D;
- 23 and
- 24 e. Several orders compelling discovery.

25
26
27 ³ The findings made in this Order are preliminary in nature based upon the limited evidence presented after very
28 limited discovery permitted on an expedited basis and may be modified based upon additional evidence presented to the
Court at the ultimate trial of the business court matters.

1 This Court reviewed the Serenity Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction and at a hearing on
2 April 22, 2019, invited Plaintiffs in related cases, not assigned to Business Court, to participate in the
3 evidentiary hearing on the Motion for Preliminary Injunction being heard in Department 11 for the
4 purposes of hearing and deciding the Motions for Preliminary Injunction.⁴

5 ***PRELIMINARY STATEMENT***

6 The Attorney General's Office was forced to deal with a significant impediment at the early
7 stages of the litigation. This inability to disclose certain information was outside of its control because
8 of confidentiality requirements that have now been slightly modified by SB 32. Although the parties
9 stipulated to a protective order on May 24, 2019, many documents produced in preparation for the
10 hearing and for discovery purposes were heavily redacted because of the highly competitive nature of
11 the industry and sensitive financial and commercial information being produced.

12 All parties agree that the language of an initiative takes precedence over any regulation that is in
13 conflict and that an administrative agency has some discretion in determining how to implement the
14 initiative. The Court gives deference to the agency in establishing those regulations and creating the
15 framework required to implement those provisions in conformity with the initiative.

16 The initiative to legalize recreational marijuana, Ballot Question 2 ("BQ2"), went to the voters
17 in 2016. The language of BQ2 is independent of any regulations that were adopted by the DoT. The
18 Court must balance the mandatory provisions of BQ2 (which the DoT did not have discretion to
19 modify);⁵ those provisions with which the DoT was granted some discretion in implementation;⁶ and

20 ⁴ The complaints filed by the parties participating in the hearing seek declaratory relief, injunctive relief and writs of
21 mandate, among other claims. The motions and joinders seeking injunctive relief which have been reviewed by the Court in
conjunction with this hearing include:

22 A786962-B Serenity: Serenity Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction filed 3/19/19 (Joinder to Motion by
23 Compassionate Team: 5/17; Joinder to Motion by ETW: 5/6 (filed in A787004); and Joinder to Motion by Nevada
24 Wellness: 5/10 (filed in A787540)); Opposition by the State filed 5/9/19 (Joinder by Essence/Thrive Entities: 5/23);
25 Opposition by Nevada Organic Remedies: 5/9 (Joinder by Lone Mountain: 5/13; Joinder by Helping Hands: 5/21; and
26 Joinder by Essence/Thrive Entities: 5/23). Application for TRO on OST filed 5/9/19 (Joinder by Compassionate Team:
27 5/17; and Joinder by ETW: 5/10 (filed in A787004)); Opposition by Nevada Organic Remedies: 5/9 (Joinder by Clear River:
28 5/9); Opposition by Essence/Thrive Entities: 5/10 (Joinder by GreenMart: 5/10; Joinder by Lone Mountain: 5/11; and
Joinder by helping Hands: 5/12).

26 A785818-W MM Development: MM Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction or Writ of Mandamus filed 5/9/19
27 (Joinder by Serenity: 5/20 (filed in A786962); Joinder by ETW: 5/6 (filed in A787004 and A785818); and Joinder by
28 Nevada Wellness: 5/10 (filed in A787540)).

⁵ Article 19, Section 2(3) provides the touchstone for the mandatory provisions:

1 the inherent discretion of an administrative agency to implement regulations to carry out its statutory
2 duties. The Court must give great deference to those activities that fall within the discretionary
3 functions of the agency. Deference is not given where the actions of the DoT were in violation of BQ2
4 or were arbitrary and capricious.

5 FINDINGS OF FACT

6 1. Nevada allows voters to amend its Constitution or enact legislation through the initiative
7 process. Nevada Constitution, Article 19, Section 2.

8 2. In 2000, the voters amended Nevada's Constitution to allow for the possession and use
9 of marijuana to treat various medical conditions. Nevada Constitution, Article 4, Section 38(1)(a). The
10

11
12
13 An initiative measure so approved by the voters shall not be amended, annulled, repealed, set aside or
14 suspended by the Legislature within 3 years from the date it takes effect.

15 ⁶ NRS 453D.200(1) required the adoption of regulations for the licensure and oversight of recreational marijuana
16 cultivation, manufacturing/production, sales and distribution, but provides the DoT discretion in exactly what those
17 regulations would include.

18 . . . the Department shall adopt all regulations necessary or convenient to carry out the provisions of this chapter.
19 The regulations must not prohibit the operation of marijuana establishments, either expressly or through regulations
20 that make their operation unreasonably impracticable. The regulations shall include:

- 21 (a) Procedures for the issuance, renewal, suspension, and revocation of a license to operate a marijuana
22 establishment;
- 23 (b) Qualifications for licensure that are directly and demonstrably related to the operation of a marijuana
24 establishment;
- 25 (c) Requirements for the security of marijuana establishments;
- 26 (d) Requirements to prevent the sale or diversion of marijuana and marijuana products to persons under 21
27 years of age;
- 28 (e) Requirements for the packaging of marijuana and marijuana products, including requirements for child-
resistant packaging;
- (f) Requirements for the testing and labeling of marijuana and marijuana products sold by marijuana
establishments including a numerical indication of potency based on the ratio of THC to the weight of a product
intended for oral consumption;
- (g) Requirements for record keeping by marijuana establishments;
- (h) Reasonable restrictions on signage, marketing, display, and advertising;
- (i) Procedures for the collection of taxes, fees, and penalties imposed by this chapter;
- (j) Procedures and requirements to enable the transfer of a license for a marijuana establishment to another
qualified person and to enable a licensee to move the location of its establishment to another suitable location;
- (k) Procedures and requirements to enable a dual licensee to operate medical marijuana establishments and
marijuana establishments at the same location;
- (l) Procedures to establish the fair market value at wholesale of marijuana; and
- (m) Civil penalties for the failure to comply with any regulation adopted pursuant to this section or for any
violation of the provisions of NRS 453D.300.

1 initiative left it to the Legislature to create laws “[a]uthoriz[ing] appropriate methods for supply of the
2 plant to patients authorized to use it.” Nevada Constitution, Article 4, Section 38(1)(e).

3 3. For several years prior to the enactment of BQ2, the regulation of medical marijuana
4 dispensaries had not been taken up by the Legislature. Some have argued in these proceedings that the
5 delay led to the framework of BQ2.

6 4. In 2013, Nevada’s legislature enacted NRS 453A, which allows for the cultivation and
7 sale of medical marijuana. The Legislature described the requirements for the application to open a
8 medical marijuana establishment. NRS 453A.322. The Nevada Legislature then charged the Division of
9 Public and Behavioral Health with evaluating the applications. NRS 453A.328.

10 5. The materials circulated to voters in 2016 for BQ2 described its purpose as the
11 amendment of the Nevada Revised Statutes as follows:
12

13 Shall the *Nevada Revised Statutes* be amended to allow a person, 21 years old or older, to
14 purchase, cultivate, possess, or consume a certain amount of marijuana or concentrated
15 marijuana, as well as manufacture, possess, use, transport, purchase, distribute, or sell marijuana
16 paraphernalia; impose a 15 percent excise tax on wholesale sales of marijuana; require the
17 regulation and licensing of marijuana cultivators, testing facilities, distributors, suppliers, and
18 retailers; and provide for certain criminal penalties?

19 6. BQ2 was enacted by the Nevada Legislature and is codified at NRS 453D.⁷

20 7. BQ2 specifically identified regulatory and public safety concerns:

21 The People of the State of Nevada proclaim that marijuana should be regulated in a manner
22 similar to alcohol so that:

- 23 (a) Marijuana may only be purchased from a business that is licensed by the State of
24 Nevada;
- 25 (b) Business owners are subject to a review by the State of Nevada to confirm that the
26 business owners and the business location are suitable to produce or sell marijuana;
- 27 (c) Cultivating, manufacturing, testing, transporting and selling marijuana will be strictly
28 controlled through State licensing and regulation;
- (d) Selling or giving marijuana to persons under 21 years of age shall remain illegal;
- (e) Individuals will have to be 21 years of age or older to purchase marijuana;
- (f) Driving under the influence of marijuana will remain illegal; and
- (g) Marijuana sold in the State will be tested and labeled.

⁷ As the provisions of BQ2 and the sections NRS 453D currently in effect (with the exception of NRS 453D.205) are identical, for ease of reference the Court cites to BQ2 as enacted by the Nevada Legislature in NRS 453D.

1 NRS 453D.020(3).

2 8. BQ2 mandated the DoT to “conduct a background check of each prospective owner,
3 officer, and board member of a marijuana establishment license applicant.” NRS 453D.200(6).

4 9. On November 8, 2016, by Executive Order 2017-02, Governor Brian Sandoval
5 established a Task Force composed of 19 members to offer suggestions and proposals for legislative,
6 regulatory, and executive actions to be taken in implementing BQ2.

7 10. The Task Force’s findings, issued on May 30, 2017, referenced the 2014 licensing
8 process for issuing Medical Marijuana Establishment Registration Certificates under NRS 453A. The
9 Task Force recommended that “the qualifications for licensure of a marijuana establishment and the
10 impartial numerically scored bidding process for retail marijuana stores be maintained as in the medical
11 marijuana program except for a change in how local jurisdictions participate in selection of locations.”
12

13 11. Some of the Task Force’s recommendations appear to conflict with BQ2.⁸
14

15 ⁸ The Final Task Force report (Exhibit 2009) contained the following statements:

16 The Task Force recommends that retail marijuana ownership interest requirements remain consistent with the
17 medical marijuana program. . . .
18 at 2510.

19 The requirement identified by the Task Force at the time was contained in NAC 453A.302(1) which states:

20 Except as otherwise required in subsection 2, the requirements of this chapter concerning owners of medical
21 marijuana establishments only apply to a person with an aggregate ownership interest of 5 percent or more in a
22 medical marijuana establishment.

23 The second recommendation of concern is:

24 The Task Force recommends that NRS 453A be changed to address companies that own marijuana establishment
25 licenses in which there are owners with less than 5% ownership interest in the company. The statute should be
26 amended to:

27 *Limit fingerprinting, background checks and renewal of agent cards to owners officers and board members with
28 5% or less cumulatively of the company to once every five years;

*Only require owners officers and board members with 5% or more cumulatively and employees of the company to
obtain agent registration cards; and

*Use the marijuana establishments governing documents to determine who has approval rights and signatory
authority for purposes of signing ownership transfers, applications and any other appropriate legal or regulatory
documents.

There was Task Force dissent on the recommendation. The concern with this recommendation was that by
changing the requirements on fingerprinting and background checks, the state would have less knowledge of when
an owner, officer, and board member commits an offense not allowed under current marijuana law, potentially
creating a less safe environment in the state.

at 2515-2516.

1 12. During the 2017 legislative session Assembly Bill 422 transferred responsibility for the
2 registration, licensing, and regulation of marijuana establishments from the State of Nevada Division of
3 Public and Behavioral Health to the DoT.⁹

4 13. On February 27, 2018, the DoT adopted regulations governing the issuance, suspension,
5 or revocation of retail recreational marijuana licenses in LCB File No. R092-17, which were codified in
6 NAC 453D (the "Regulations").

7 14. The Regulations for licensing were to be "directly and demonstrably related to the
8 operation of a marijuana establishment." NRS 453D.200(1)(b). The phrase "directly and demonstrably
9 related to the operation of a marijuana establishment" is subject to more than one interpretation.
10

21
22 ⁹ Those provisions (a portion of which became NRS 453D.205) are consistent with BQ2:

23 1. When conducting a background check pursuant to subsection 6 of NRS 453D.200, the Department may
24 require each prospective owner, officer and board member of a marijuana establishment license applicant to submit
25 a complete set of fingerprints and written permission authorizing the Department to forward the fingerprints to the
Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History for submission to the Federal Bureau of Investigation
for its report.

26 2. When determining the criminal history of a person pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection 1 of NRS
27 453D.300, a marijuana establishment may require the person to submit to the Department a complete set of
fingerprints and written permission authorizing the Department to forward the fingerprints to the Central
Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History for submission to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its
28 report.

1 15. A person holding a medical marijuana establishment registration certificate could apply
2 for one or more recreational marijuana establishment licenses within the time set forth by the DoT in
3 the manner described in the application. NAC 453D.268.¹⁰
4

5 ¹⁰ Relevant portions of that provision require that application be made

6 ... by submitting an application in response to a request for applications issued pursuant to NAC 453D.260 which
7 must include:

8 ***

9 2. An application on a form prescribed by the Department. The application must include, without limitation:

10 (a) Whether the applicant is applying for a license for a marijuana establishment for a marijuana cultivation
11 facility, a marijuana distributor, a marijuana product manufacturing facility, a marijuana testing facility or a retail
12 marijuana store;

13 (b) The name of the proposed marijuana establishment, as reflected in both the medical marijuana establishment
14 registration certificate held by the applicant, if applicable, and the articles of incorporation or other documents filed
15 with the Secretary of State;

16 (c) The type of business organization of the applicant, such as individual, corporation, partnership, limited-liability
17 company, association or cooperative, joint venture or any other business organization;

18 (d) Confirmation that the applicant has registered with the Secretary of State as the appropriate type of business,
19 and the articles of incorporation, articles of organization or partnership or joint venture documents of the applicant;

20 (e) The physical address where the proposed marijuana establishment will be located and the physical address of
21 any co-owned or otherwise affiliated marijuana establishments;

22 (f) The mailing address of the applicant;

23 (g) The telephone number of the applicant;

24 (h) The electronic mail address of the applicant;

25 (i) A signed copy of the Request and Consent to Release Application Form for Marijuana Establishment License
26 prescribed by the Department;

27 (j) If the applicant is applying for a license for a retail marijuana store, the proposed hours of operation during
28 which the retail marijuana store plans to be available to sell marijuana to consumers;

 (k) An attestation that the information provided to the Department to apply for the license for a marijuana
establishment is true and correct according to the information known by the affiant at the time of signing; and

 (l) The signature of a natural person for the proposed marijuana establishment as described in subsection 1 of NAC
453D.250 and the date on which the person signed the application.

3. Evidence of the amount of taxes paid, or other beneficial financial contributions made, to this State or its
political subdivisions within the last 5 years by the applicant or the persons who are proposed to be owners, officers
or board members of the proposed marijuana establishment.

4. A description of the proposed organizational structure of the proposed marijuana establishment, including,
without limitation:

 (a) An organizational chart showing all owners, officers and board members of the proposed marijuana
establishment;

 (b) A list of all owners, officers and board members of the proposed marijuana establishment that contains the
following information for each person:

 (1) The title of the person;

 (2) The race, ethnicity and gender of the person;

 (3) A short description of the role in which the person will serve for the organization and his or her
responsibilities;

 (4) Whether the person will be designated by the proposed marijuana establishment to provide written notice to
the Department when a marijuana establishment agent is employed by, volunteers at or provides labor as a
marijuana establishment agent at the proposed marijuana establishment;

 (5) Whether the person has served or is currently serving as an owner, officer or board member for another
medical marijuana establishment or marijuana establishment;

 (6) Whether the person has served as an owner, officer or board member for a medical marijuana establishment
or marijuana establishment that has had its medical marijuana establishment registration certificate or license, as
applicable, revoked;

1 NRS 453D.210(6) mandated the DoT to use “an impartial and numerically scored competitive bidding
2 process” to determine successful applicants where competing applications were submitted.

3 16. NAC 453D.272(1) provides the procedure for when the DoT receives more than one
4 “complete” application. Under this provision the DoT will determine if the “application is complete and

5 (7) Whether the person has previously had a medical marijuana establishment agent registration card or
6 marijuana establishment agent registration card revoked;

7 (8) Whether the person is an attending provider of health care currently providing written documentation for the
8 issuance of registry identification cards or letters of approval;

9 (9) Whether the person is a law enforcement officer;

10 (10) Whether the person is currently an employee or contractor of the Department; and

11 (11) Whether the person has an ownership or financial investment interest in any other medical marijuana
12 establishment or marijuana establishment.

13 5. For each owner, officer and board member of the proposed marijuana establishment:

14 (a) An attestation signed and dated by the owner, officer or board member that he or she has not been convicted of
15 an excluded felony offense, and that the information provided to support the application for a license for a
16 marijuana establishment is true and correct;

17 (b) A narrative description, not to exceed 750 words, demonstrating:

18 (1) Past experience working with governmental agencies and highlighting past experience in giving back to the
19 community through civic or philanthropic involvement;

20 (2) Any previous experience at operating other businesses or nonprofit organizations; and

21 (3) Any demonstrated knowledge, business experience or expertise with respect to marijuana; and

22 (c) A resume.

23 6. Documentation concerning the size of the proposed marijuana establishment, including, without limitation,
24 building and general floor plans with supporting details.

25 7. The integrated plan of the proposed marijuana establishment for the care, quality and safekeeping of marijuana
26 from seed to sale, including, without limitation, a plan for testing and verifying marijuana, a transportation or
27 delivery plan and procedures to ensure adequate security measures, including, without limitation, building security
28 and product security.

8. A plan for the business which includes, without limitation, a description of the inventory control system of the
proposed marijuana establishment to satisfy the requirements of NRS 453D.300 and NAC 453D.426.

9. A financial plan which includes, without limitation:

(a) Financial statements showing the resources of the applicant;

(b) If the applicant is relying on money from an owner, officer or board member, evidence that the person has
unconditionally committed such money to the use of the applicant in the event the Department awards a license to
the applicant and the applicant obtains the necessary approvals from the locality to operate the proposed marijuana
establishment; and

(c) Proof that the applicant has adequate money to cover all expenses and costs of the first year of operation.

10. Evidence that the applicant has a plan to staff, educate and manage the proposed marijuana establishment on a
daily basis, which must include, without limitation:

(a) A detailed budget for the proposed marijuana establishment, including pre-opening, construction and first-year
operating expenses;

(b) An operations manual that demonstrates compliance with this chapter;

(c) An education plan which must include, without limitation, providing educational materials to the staff of the
proposed marijuana establishment; and

(d) A plan to minimize the environmental impact of the proposed marijuana establishment.

11. If the application is submitted on or before November 15, 2018, for a license for a marijuana distributor,
proof that the applicant holds a wholesale dealer license issued pursuant to chapter 369 of NRS, unless the
Department determines that an insufficient number of marijuana distributors will result from this limitation.

12. A response to and information which supports any other criteria the Department determines to be relevant,
which will be specified and requested by the Department at the time the Department issues a request for
applications which includes the point values that will be allocated to the applicable portions of the application
pursuant to subsection 2 of NAC 453D.260.

1 in compliance with this chapter and Chapter 453D of NRS, the Department will rank the applications . .
2 . in order from first to last based on the compliance with the provisions of this chapter and chapter
3 453D of NRS and on the content of the applications relating to . . .” several enumerated factors. NAC
4 453D.272(1).

5 17. The factors set forth in NAC 453D.272(1) that are used to rank competing applications
6 (collectively, the “Factors”) are:

- 7
- 8 (a) Whether the owners, officers or board members have experience operating another kind
9 of business that has given them experience which is applicable to the operation of a marijuana
10 establishment;
 - 11 (b) The diversity of the owners, officers or board members of the proposed marijuana
12 establishment;
 - 13 (c) The educational achievements of the owners, officers or board members of the proposed
14 marijuana establishment;
 - 15 (d) The financial plan and resources of the applicant, both liquid and illiquid;
 - 16 (e) Whether the applicant has an adequate integrated plan for the care, quality and
17 safekeeping of marijuana from seed to sale;
 - 18 (f) The amount of taxes paid and other beneficial financial contributions, including, without
19 limitation, civic or philanthropic involvement with this State or its political subdivisions, by the
20 applicant or the owners, officers or board members of the proposed marijuana establishment;
 - 21 (g) Whether the owners, officers or board members of the proposed marijuana establishment
22 have direct experience with the operation of a medical marijuana establishment or marijuana
23 establishment in this State and have demonstrated a record of operating such an establishment in
24 compliance with the laws and regulations of this State for an adequate period of time to
25 demonstrate success;
 - 26 (h) The (unspecified) experience of key personnel that the applicant intends to employ in
27 operating the type of marijuana establishment for which the applicant seeks a license; and
 - 28 (i) Any other criteria that the Department determines to be relevant.

18. Each of the Factors is within the DoT’s discretion in implementing the application
process provided for in BQ2. The DoT had a good-faith basis for determining that each of the Factors
is “directly and demonstrably related to the operation of a marijuana establishment.”

19. The DoT posted the application on its website and released the application for
recreational marijuana establishment licenses on July 6, 2018.¹¹

¹¹ The DoT made a change to the application after circulating the first version of the application to delete the
requirement of a physical location. The modification resulted in a different version of the application bearing the same
“footer” with the original version remaining available on the DoT’s website.

1 20. The DoT utilized a question and answer process through a generic email account at
2 marijuana@tax.state.nv.us to allow applicants to ask questions and receive answers directly from the
3 Department, which were not consistent with NRS 453D, and that information was not further
4 disseminated by the DoT to other applicants.

5 21. In addition to the email question and answer process, the DoT permitted applicants and
6 their representatives to personally contact the DoT staff about the application process.

7 22. The application period ran from September 7, 2018 through September 20, 2018.

8 23. The DoT accepted applications in September 2018 for retail recreational marijuana
9 licenses and announced the award of conditional licenses in December 2018.

10 24. The DoT used a listserv to communicate with prospective applicants.

11 25. The DoT published a revised application on July 30, 2018. This revised application was
12 sent to all participants in the DoT's listserv directory. The revised application modified a sentence on
13 attachment A of the application. Prior to this revision, the sentence had read, "Marijuana
14 Establishment's proposed physical address (this must be a Nevada address and cannot be a P.O. Box)."
15 The revised application on July 30, 2018, read: "Marijuana Establishment's proposed physical address
16 if the applicant owns property or has secured a lease or other property agreement (this must be a
17 Nevada address and not a P.O. Box). Otherwise, the applications are virtually identical.

18 26. The DoT sent a copy of the revised application through the listserv service used by the
19 DoT. Not all Plaintiffs' correct emails were included on this listserv service.

20 27. The July 30, 2018 application, like its predecessor, described how applications were to
21 be scored. The scoring criteria was divided into identified criteria and non-identified criteria. The
22 maximum points that could be awarded to any applicant based on these criteria was 250 points.

23 28. The identified criteria consisted of organizational structure of the applicant (60 points);
24 evidence of taxes paid to the State of Nevada by owners, officers, and board members of the applicant
25
26
27
28

1 in the last 5 years (25 points); a financial plan (30 points); and documents from a financial institution
2 showing unencumbered liquid assets of \$250,000 per location for which an application is submitted.

3 29. The non-identified criteria consisted of documentation concerning the integrated plan of
4 the proposed marijuana establishment for the care, quality and safekeeping of marijuana from seed to
5 sale (40 points); evidence that the applicant has a plan to staff, educate and manage the proposed
6 recreational marijuana establishment on a daily basis (30 points); a plan describing operating
7 procedures for the electronic verification system of the proposed marijuana establishment and
8 describing the proposed establishment's inventory control system (20 points); building plans showing
9 the proposed establishment's adequacy to serve the needs of its customers (20 points); and, a proposal
10 explaining likely impact of the proposed marijuana establishment in the community and how it will
11 meet customer needs (15 points).
12

13 30. An applicant was permitted to submit a single application for all jurisdictions in which it
14 was applying, and the application would be scored at the same time.
15

16 31. By September 20, 2018, the DoT received a total of 462 applications.

17 32. In order to grade and rank the applications the DoT posted notices that it was seeking to
18 hire individuals with specified qualifications necessary to evaluate applications. The DoT interviewed
19 applicants and made decisions on individuals to hire for each position.

20 33. When decisions were made on who to hire, the individuals were notified that they would
21 need to register with "Manpower" under a pre-existing contract between the DoT and that company.
22 Individuals would be paid through Manpower, as their application-grading work would be of a
23 temporary nature.
24

25 34. The DoT identified, hired, and trained eight individuals to grade the applications,
26 including three to grade the identified portions of the applications, three to grade the non-identified
27
28

1 portions of the applications, and one administrative assistant for each group of graders (collectively the
2 “Temporary Employees”).

3 35. It is unclear how the DoT trained the Temporary Employees. While portions of the
4 training materials were introduced into evidence, testimony regarding the oral training based upon
5 example applications was insufficient for the Court to determine the nature and extent of the training of
6 the Temporary Employees.¹²

7 36. NAC 453D.272(1) required the DoT to determine that an Application is “complete and
8 in compliance” with the provisions of NAC 453D in order to properly apply the licensing criteria set
9 forth therein and the provisions of the Ballot Initiative and the enabling statute.

10 37. When the DoT received applications, it undertook no effort to determine if the
11 applications were in fact “complete and in compliance.”

12 38. In evaluating whether an application was “complete and in compliance” the DoT made
13 no effort to verify owners, officers or board members (except for checking whether a transfer request
14 was made and remained pending before the DoT).

15 39. For purposes of grading the applicant’s organizational structure and diversity, if an
16 applicant’s disclosure in its application of its owners, officers, and board members did not match the
17 DoT’s own records, the DoT did not penalize the applicant. Rather the DoT permitted the grading, and
18 in some cases, awarded a conditional license to an applicant under such circumstances, and dealt with
19 the issue by simply informing the winning applicant that its application would have to be brought into
20 conformity with DoT records.

21 40. The DoT created a Regulation that modified the mandatory BQ2 provision “[t]he
22 Department shall conduct a background check of each prospective owner, officer, and board member of
23 a marijuana establishment license applicant” and determined it would only require information on the
24

25
26
27
28 ¹² Given the factual issues related to the grading raised by MM and LivFree, these issues may be subject to additional
evidentiary proceedings in the assigned department.

1 application from persons “with an aggregate ownership interest of 5 percent or more in a marijuana
2 establishment.” NAC 453D.255(1).

3 41. NRS 453D.200(6) provides that “[t]he DoT shall conduct a background check of each
4 prospective owner, officer, and board member of a marijuana establishment license applicant.” The
5 DoT departed from this mandatory language in NAC 453D.255(1) and made no attempt in the
6 application process to verify that the applicant’s complied with the mandatory language of the BQ2 or
7 even the impermissibly modified language.
8

9 42. The DoT made the determination that it was not reasonable to require industry to
10 provide every owner of a prospective licensee. The DOT’s determination that only owners of a 5% or
11 greater interest in the business were required to submit information on the application was not a
12 permissible regulatory modification of BQ2. This determination violated Article 19, Section 3 of the
13 Nevada Constitution. The determination was not based on a rational basis.
14

15 43. The limitation of “unreasonably impracticable” in BQ2¹³ does not apply to the
16 mandatory language of BQ2, but to the Regulations which the DoT adopted.

17 44. The adoption of NAC 453D.255(1), as it applies to the application process is an
18 unconstitutional modification of BQ2.¹⁴ The failure of the DoT to carry out the mandatory provisions
19 of NRS 453D.200(6) is fatal to the application process.¹⁵ The DoT’s decision to adopt regulations in
20 direct violation of BQ2’s mandatory application requirements is violative of Article 19, Section 2(3) of
21 the Nevada Constitution.
22

23 ¹³ NRS 453D.200(1) provides in part:

24 The regulations must not prohibit the operation of marijuana establishments, either expressly or through regulations
25 that make their operation unreasonably impracticable.

26 ¹⁴ For administrative and regulatory proceedings other than the application, the limitation of 5% or greater ownership
27 appears within the DoT’s discretion.

28 ¹⁵ That provision states:

6. The Department shall conduct a background check of each prospective owner, officer, and board member of a
marijuana establishment license applicant.

1 45. Given the lack of a robust investigative process for applicants, the requirement of the
2 background check for each prospective owner, officer, and board member as part of the application
3 process impedes an important public safety goal in BQ2.

4 46. Without any consideration as to the voters mandate in BQ2, the DoT determined that
5 requiring each prospective owner be subject to a background check was too difficult for
6 implementation by industry. This decision was a violation of the Nevada Constitution, an abuse of
7 discretion, and arbitrary and capricious.

8 47. The DoT did not comply with BQ2 by requiring applicants to provide information for
9 each prospective owner, officer and board member or verify the ownership of applicants applying for
10 retail recreational marijuana licenses. Instead the DoT issued conditional licenses to applicants who
11 did not identify each prospective owner, officer and board member.¹⁶

12 48. The DoT's late decision to delete the physical address requirement on some application
13 forms while not modifying those portions of the application that were dependent on a physical location
14 (i.e. floor plan, community impact, security plan, and the sink locations) after the repeated
15 communications by an applicant's agent; not effectively communicating the revision; and, leaving the
16 original version of the application on the website, is evidence of conduct that is a serious issue.

17 49. Pursuant to NAC 453D.295, the winning applicants received a conditional license that
18 will not be finalized unless within twelve months of December 5, 2018, the licensees receive a final
19 inspection of their marijuana establishment.
20
21
22
23
24

25 ¹⁶ Some applicants apparently provided the required information for each prospective owner, officer and board
26 member. Accepting as truthful these applicants' attestations regarding who their owners, officers, and board members were
27 at the time of the application, these applications were complete at the time they were filed with reference to NRS
28 453D.200(6). These entities are Green Therapeutics LLC, Eureka NewGen Farms LLC, Circle S Farms LLC, Deep Roots
Medical LLC, Pure Tonic Concentrates LLC, Wellness Connection of Nevada LLC, Polaris Wellness Center LLC, and
TRNVP098 LLC, Clear River LLC, Cheyenne Medical LLC, Essence Tropicana LLC, Essence Henderson LLC, and
Commerce Park Medical LLC. See Court Exhibit 3 (post-hearing submission by the DoT).

50. The few instances of clear mistakes made by the Temporary Employees admitted in evidence do not, in and of themselves, result in an unfair process as human error occurs in every process.

51. Nothing in NRS 453D or NAC 453D provides for any right to an appeal or review of a decision denying an application for a retail recreational marijuana license.

52. There are an extremely limited number of licenses available for the sale of recreational marijuana.

53. The number of licenses available was set by BQ2 and is contained in NRS 453D.210(5)(d).

54. Since the Court does not have authority to order additional licenses in particular jurisdictions, and because there are a limited number of licenses that are available in certain jurisdictions, injunctive relief is necessary to permit the Plaintiffs, if successful in the NRS 453D.210(6) process, to actually obtaining a license, if ultimately successful in this litigation.

55. The secondary market for the transfer of licenses is limited.¹⁷

56. If any findings of fact are properly conclusions of law, they shall be treated as if appropriately identified and designated.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

57. “Any person...whose rights, status or other legal relations are affected by a statute, municipal ordinance, contract or franchise, may have determined any question of construction or validity arising under the instrument, statute, ordinance, contract or franchise and obtain a declaration of rights, status or other legal relations thereunder.” NRS 30.040.

58. A justiciable controversy is required to exist prior to an award of declaratory relief. *Doe v. Bryan*, 102 Nev. 523, 525, 728 P.2d 443, 444 (1986).

¹⁷ The testimony elicited during the evidentiary hearing established that multiple changes in ownership have occurred since the applications were filed. Given this testimony, simply updating the applications previously filed would not comply with BO2.

1 59. NRS 33.010 governs cases in which an injunction may be granted. The applicant must
2 show (1) a likelihood of success on the merits; and (2) a reasonable probability that the non-moving
3 party's conduct, if allowed to continue, will cause irreparable harm for which compensatory damage is
4 an inadequate remedy.

5 60. Plaintiffs have the burden to demonstrate that the DoT's conduct, if allowed to continue,
6 will result in irreparable harm for which compensatory damages is an inadequate remedy.

7 61. The purpose of a preliminary injunction is to preserve the *status quo* until the matter can
8 be litigated on the merits.

9 62. In *City of Sparks v. Sparks Mun. Court*, the Supreme Court explained, "[a]s a
10 constitutional violation may be difficult or impossible to remedy through money damages, such a
11 violation may, by itself, be sufficient to constitute irreparable harm." 129 Nev. 348, 357, 302 P.3d
12 1118, 1124 (2013).

13 63. Article 19, Section 2 of the Constitution of the State of Nevada provides, in pertinent
14 part:

15 "1. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of article 4 of this constitution, but subject to the
16 limitations of section 6 of this article, **the people reserve to themselves the power to propose,**
17 **by initiative petition, statutes and amendments to statutes and amendments to this**
18 **constitution, and to enact or reject them at the polls.**

19 ...

20 3. If the initiative petition proposes a statute or an amendment to a statute, the person who
21 intends to circulate it shall file a copy with the secretary of state before beginning circulation
22 and not earlier than January 1 of the year preceding the year in which a regular session of the
23 legislature is held. After its circulation, it shall be filed with the secretary of state not less than
24 30 days prior to any regular session of the legislature. The circulation of the petition shall cease
25 on the day the petition is filed with the secretary of state or such other date as may be prescribed
26 for the verification of the number of signatures affixed to the petition, whichever is earliest. The
27 secretary of state shall transmit such petition to the legislature as soon as the legislature
28 convenes and organizes. The petition shall take precedence over all other measures except
appropriation bills, and the statute or amendment to a statute proposed thereby shall be enacted
or rejected by the legislature without change or amendment within 40 days. If the proposed
statute or amendment to a statute is enacted by the legislature and approved by the governor in
the same manner as other statutes are enacted, such statute or amendment to a statute shall
become law, but shall be subject to referendum petition as provided in section 1 of this article.

1 If the statute or amendment to a statute is rejected by the legislature, or if no action is taken
2 thereon within 40 days, the secretary of state shall submit the question of approval or
3 disapproval of such statute or amendment to a statute to a vote of the voters at the next
4 succeeding general election. If a majority of the voters voting on such question at such election
5 votes approval of such statute or amendment to a statute, it shall become law and take effect
6 upon completion of the canvass of votes by the supreme court. **An initiative measure so
approved by the voters shall not be amended, annulled, repealed, set aside or suspended
by the legislature within 3 years from the date it takes effect.**

7 (Emphasis added.)

8 64. The Nevada Supreme Court has recognized that “[i]nitiative petitions must be kept
9 substantively intact; otherwise, the people’s voice would be obstructed. . . [I]nitiative legislation is not
10 subject to judicial tampering-the substance of an initiative petition should reflect the unadulterated will
11 of the people and should proceed, if at all, as originally proposed and signed. For this reason, our
12 constitution prevents the Legislature from changing or amending a proposed initiative petition that is
13 under consideration.” Rogers v. Heller, 117 Nev. 169, 178, 18 P.3d 1034,1039–40 (2001).

14 65. BQ2 provides, “the Department shall adopt all regulations necessary or convenient to
15 carry out the provisions of this chapter.” NRS 453D.200(1). This language does not confer upon the
16 DoT unfettered or unbridled authority to do whatever it wishes without constraint. The DoT was not
17 delegated the power to legislate amendments because this is initiative legislation. The Legislature itself
18 has no such authority with regard to NRS 453D until three years after its enactment under the
19 prohibition of Article 19, Section 2 of the Constitution of the State of Nevada.
20

21 66. Where, as here, amendment of a voter-initiated law is temporally precluded from
22 amendment for three years, the administrative agency may not modify the law.

23 67. NRS 453D.200(1) provides that “the Department shall adopt all regulations necessary or
24 convenient to carry out the provisions of this chapter.” The Court finds that the words “necessary or
25 convenient” are susceptible to at least two reasonable interpretations. This limitation applies only to
26 Regulations adopted by the DoT.
27
28

1 68. While the category of diversity is not specifically included in the language of BQ2, the
2 evidence presented in the hearing demonstrates that a rational basis existed for the inclusion of this
3 category in the Factors and the application.

4 69. The DoT's inclusion of the diversity category was implemented in a way that created a
5 process which was partial and subject to manipulation by applicants.

6 70. The DoT staff provided various applicants with different information as to what would
7 be utilized from this category and whether it would be used merely as a tiebreaker or as a substantive
8 category.
9

10 71. Based upon the evidence adduced, the Court finds that the DoT selectively discussed
11 with applicants or their agents the modification of the application related to physical address
12 information.

13 72. The process was impacted by personal relationships in decisions related to the
14 requirements of the application and the ownership structures of competing applicants. This in and of
15 itself is insufficient to void the process as urged by some of the Plaintiffs.
16

17 73. The DoT disseminated various versions of the 2018 Retail Marijuana Application, one
18 of which was published on the DoT's website and required the applicant to provide an actual physical
19 Nevada address for the proposed marijuana establishment, and not a P.O. Box, (*see* Exhibit 5), whereas
20 an alternative version of the DoT's application form, which was not made publicly available and was
21 distributed to some, but not all, of the applicants via a DoT listserv service, deleted the requirement that
22 applicants disclose an actual physical address for their proposed marijuana establishment. *See* Exhibit
23 5A.
24

25 74. The applicants were applying for conditional licensure, which would last for 1 year.
26 NAC 453D.282. The license was conditional based on the applicant's gaining approval from local
27
28

1 authorities on zoning and land use, the issuance of a business license, and the Department of Taxation
2 inspections of the marijuana establishment.

3 75. The DoT has only awarded conditional licenses which are subject to local government
4 approval related to zoning and planning and may approve a location change of an existing license, the
5 public safety aspects of the failure to require an actual physical address can be cured prior to the award
6 of a final license.

7
8 76. By selectively eliminating the requirement to disclose an actual physical address for
9 each and every proposed retail recreational marijuana establishment, the DoT limited the ability of the
10 Temporary Employees to adequately assess graded criteria such as (i) prohibited proximity to schools
11 and certain other public facilities, (ii) impact on the community, (iii) security, (iv) building plans, and
12 (v) other material considerations prescribed by the Regulations.

13 77. The hiring of Temporary Employees was well within the DoT's discretionary power.

14 78. The evidence establishes that the DoT failed to properly train the Temporary
15 Employees. This is not an appropriate basis for the requested injunctive relief unless it makes the
16 grading process unfair.

17
18 79. The DoT failed to establish any quality assurance or quality control of the grading done
19 by Temporary Employees.¹⁸ This is not an appropriate basis for the requested injunctive relief unless it
20 makes the grading process unfair.

21 80. The DoT made licensure conditional for one year based on the grant of power to create
22 regulations that develop "[p]rocedures for the issuance, renewal, suspension, and revocation of a
23 license to operate a marijuana establishment." NRS 453D.200(1)(a). This was within the DoT's
24 discretion.
25
26
27

28 ¹⁸ The Court makes no determination as to the extent which the grading errors alleged by MM and Live Free may be
subject to other appropriate writ practice related to those individualized issues by the assigned department.

1 81. Certain of DoT's actions related to the licensing process were nondiscretionary
2 modifications of BQ2's mandatory requirements. The evidence establishes DoT's deviations
3 constituted arbitrary and capricious conduct without any rational basis for the deviation.

4 82. The DoT's decision to not require disclosure on the application and to not conduct
5 background checks of persons owning less than 5% prior to award of a conditional license is an
6 impermissible deviation from the mandatory language of BQ2, which mandated "a background check
7 of each prospective owner, officer, and board member of a marijuana establishment license applicant."
8 NRS 453D.200(6).
9

10 83. The argument that the requirement for each owner to comply with the application
11 process and background investigation is "unreasonably impracticable" is misplaced. The limitation of
12 unreasonably impracticable applied only to the Regulations not to the language and compliance with
13 BQ2 itself.

14 84. Under the circumstances presented here, the Court concludes that certain of the
15 Regulations created by the DoT are unreasonable, inconsistent with BQ2 and outside of any discretion
16 permitted to the DoT.
17

18 85. The DoT acted beyond its scope of authority when it arbitrarily and capriciously
19 replaced the mandatory requirement of BQ2, for the background check of each prospective owner,
20 officer and board member with the 5% or greater standard in NAC 453.255(1). This decision by the
21 DoT was not one they were permitted to make as it resulted in a modification of BQ2 in violation of
22 Article 19, Section 2(3) of the Nevada Constitution.
23

24 86. As Plaintiffs have shown that the DoT clearly violated NRS Chapter 453D, the claims
25 for declaratory relief, petition for writ of prohibition, and any other related claims is likely to succeed
26 on the merits.

27 87. The balance of equities weighs in favor of Plaintiffs.
28

1 88. “[N]o restraining order or preliminary injunction shall issue except upon the giving of
2 adequate security by the applicant, in such sum as the court deems proper, for the payment of such
3 costs and damages as may be incurred or suffered by any party who is found to be wrongfully enjoined
4 or restrained.” NRCP 65(d).

5 89. The DoT stands to suffer no appreciable losses and will suffer only minimal harm as a
6 result of an injunction.

7 90. Therefore, a security bond already ordered in the amount of \$400,000 is sufficient for
8 the issuance of this injunctive relief.¹⁹
9

10 91. If any conclusions of law are properly findings of fact, they shall be treated as if
11 appropriately identified and designated.

12 / / / / /
13 / / / / /
14 / / / / /
15 / / / / /
16 / / / / /
17 / / / / /
18 / / / / /
19 / / / / /
20 / / / / /
21 / / / / /
22 / / / / /
23 / / / / /
24 / / / / /
25
26

27 ¹⁹ As discussed during the preliminary injunction hearing, the Court sets a separate evidentiary hearing on whether to
28 increase the amount of this bond. That hearing is set for August 29, 2019, at 9:00 a.m.

ORDER


IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED ORDERED AND DECREED that Plaintiffs' Motions for Preliminary Injunction are granted in part.

The State is enjoined from conducting a final inspection of any of the conditional licenses issued in or about December 2018 who did not provide the identification of each prospective owner, officer and board member as required by NRS 453D.200(6) pending a trial on the merits.²⁰

The issue of whether to increase the existing bond is set for hearing on August 29, 2019, at 9:00 am.

The parties in A786962 and A787004 are to appear for a Rule 16 conference September 9, 2019, at 9:00 am and submit their respective plans for discovery on an expedited schedule by noon on September 6, 2019.

DATED this 7th day of February 2020.


Elizabeth Gonzalez, District Court Judge

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on the date filed, this Order was electronically served, pursuant to N.E.F.C.R. Rule 9, to all registered parties in the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing Program.


Dan Kutinac

²⁰ As Court Exhibit 3 is a post-hearing submission by the DoT, the parties may file objections and/or briefs related to this issue. Any issues related to the inclusion or exclusion from this group will be heard August 29, 2019, at 9:00 am.