

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

STATE OF NEVADA ex rel. NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO, in her official capacity as Senate Majority Leader of the Senate of the State of Nevada; CLAIRE J. CLIFT, in her official capacity as Secretary of the Senate of the State of Nevada; LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU, LEGAL DIVISION, in its official capacity as the legal agency of the Legislative Department of the State of Nevada; BRENDA J. ERDOES, Esq., in her official capacity as Legislative Counsel and Chief of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Legal Division, and in her professional capacity as an attorney and licensed member of the State Bar of Nevada; and KEVIN C. POWERS, Esq., in his official capacity as Chief Litigation Counsel of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Legal Division, and in his professional capacity as an attorney and licensed member of the State Bar of Nevada,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, in and for CARSON CITY; and THE HONORABLE JAMES TODD RUSSELL, District Judge,

Respondents, and

JAMES A. SETTELMAYER, JOSEPH P. HARDY, HEIDI SEEVERS GANSERT,

Electronically Filed
Feb 06 2020 11:56 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Case No. 80313

Original Action for Writ to
First Judicial District Court,
Carson City, Nevada,
Case No. 19 OC 00127 1B

**PETITIONERS' MOTION
TO SUPPLEMENT
RECORD REGARDING
JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES**

SCOTT T. HAMMOND, PETE
GOICOECHEA, BEN KIECKHEFER,
IRA D. HANSEN, and KEITH F.
PICKARD, in their official capacities as
members of the Senate of the State of
Nevada and individually,

Real Parties in Interest.

**PETITIONERS' MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT RECORD
REGARDING JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES**

BRENDA J. ERDOES, Legislative Counsel

Nevada Bar No. 3644

KEVIN C. POWERS, Chief Litigation Counsel

Nevada Bar No. 6781

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU, LEGAL DIVISION

401 S. Carson St.

Carson City, NV 89701

Tel: (775) 684-6830; Fax: (775) 684-6761

E-mail: kpowers@lcb.state.nv.us

Attorneys for Petitioners

MOTION

Pursuant to NRAP 27, Petitioners hereby file this motion to supplement the record regarding jurisdictional issues with the attached certified copy of the resolution adopted and approved by the Legislative Commission at its meeting on February 6, 2020, in response to Plaintiff Senators' suggestion—made in a footnote in their answer without any cogent argument—that this mandamus action has potential jurisdictional defects due to improper authorization by the Legislative Commission at its meeting on December 30, 2019. (*Answer 6.*)

For the stated purpose in the resolution of removing any doubts regarding its authorization, the Legislative Commission: (1) ratified its approval of the action item as set forth by LCB Legal at the meeting on December 30, 2019, which clearly authorized LCB Legal under NRS 218F.720 to prosecute this mandamus action on behalf of Petitioners; and (2) ratified the petition for writ of mandamus (“writ petition”) filed by LCB Legal on behalf of Petitioners and all other actions taken by LCB Legal on behalf of Petitioners in this mandamus action. (*Supp’l Ex. 1 at 4.*) In addition, under the ordinary rules of ratification by a public body, the Legislative Commission’s ratification in the resolution relates back to the date of its approval of the action item as set forth by LCB Legal at the meeting on December 30, 2019, which clearly authorized LCB Legal under NRS 218F.720 to prosecute this mandamus action on behalf of petitioners. Id.

Therefore, even if this Court has any doubts regarding the Legislative Commission's authorization at its meeting on December 30, 2019, the Legislative Commission has removed any and all doubts by adopting and approving the resolution providing for the ratification of its authorization of this mandamus action on behalf of Petitioners. Accordingly, Petitioners ask this Court to grant their motion to supplement the record regarding jurisdictional issues with the attached certified copy of the resolution adopted and approved by the Legislative Commission at its meeting on February 6, 2020.

ARGUMENT

Because an original action for mandamus is not an appeal, “there is no ‘record on appeal’ in a mandamus proceeding”; therefore, “the requirements for supplementing the record on an appeal do not apply in a mandamus proceeding.” Ex parte PinnOak Res., 26 So.3d 1190, 1197 n.6 (Ala. 2009) (quoting Ex parte Trawick, 959 So.2d 51, 62-63 (Ala. 2006)). Instead, in a mandamus proceeding, this Court may permit a party to supplement the mandamus record for “good cause.” NRAP 2 (providing that this Court may enter appropriate orders in a particular case to “expedite its decision or for other good cause.”); Daniels v. State, 100 Nev. 579, 581 n.2 (1984) (allowing appellant’s counsel to supplement the record on appeal for good cause), *overruled on other grounds by* Varwig v. State, 104 Nev. 40 (1988).

In this case, Petitioners have good cause to supplement the mandamus record because the Legislative Commission's resolution definitively responds to Plaintiff Senators' suggestion of lack of jurisdiction and removes any and all doubts that the Legislative Commission authorized LCB Legal to prosecute this mandamus action on behalf of Petitioners. By removing any and all doubts regarding the Legislative Commission's authorization, the resolution forestalls and eliminates any jurisdictional issues and thereby ensures that this mandamus action can be decided on the merits of the disqualification issues in line with this Court's "policy of resolving cases on the merits whenever possible." Kim v. Dickinson Wright, PLLC, 135 Nev. 161, 164 n.5 (2019).

Furthermore, given that the jurisdictional issue was not raised properly or presented adequately with cogent argument by counsel for Plaintiff Senators, Petitioners have good cause to supplement the mandamus record to compensate for opposing counsel's inadequate appellate practices. See Barry v. Lindner, 119 Nev. 661, 671 (2003) ("This court expects all appeals to be pursued with high standards of diligence, professionalism, and competence."); Polk v. State, 126 Nev. 180, 184 (2010). Under this Court's standards, all attorneys have a duty to avoid inadequate appellate practices, such as suggesting potential issues without including "cogent argument and citation to relevant authority." Berkson v. Lepome, 126 Nev. 492,

501-02 (2010) (“It is well established that this court need not consider issues not supported by cogent argument and citation to relevant authority.”).

In this case, counsel for Plaintiff Senators used a footnote in their statement of the case and facts—rather than making cogent arguments in the argument section of their answer—to suggest that “[i]f Petitioners’ writ petition is defective because it was not properly authorized by the Legislative Commission, this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider the instant writ petition.” (*Answer 6.*) Ordinarily, under this Court’s standards for acceptable appellate practice, it may summarily reject contentions that are raised only in a footnote and presented without any cogent argument. Maresca v. State, 103 Nev. 669, 673 (1987) (“It is [counsel’s] responsibility to present relevant authority and cogent argument; issues not so presented need not be addressed by this court.”); John Wyeth & Bro. v. CIGNA Int’l, 119 F.3d 1070, 1076 n.6 (3d Cir. 1997) (“[A]rguments raised in passing (such as, in a footnote), but not squarely argued, are considered waived.”).

However, this Court has an independent obligation to ascertain whether it has jurisdiction in every case, even when counsel does not adequately argue the jurisdictional issue. Phillips v. Welch, 11 Nev. 187, 188 (1876) (“Every court is bound to know the limits of its own jurisdiction, and to keep within them. . . . [W]hen a doubt is suggested as to our authority to decide a cause, if counsel decline to argue the point, we are bound to determine it without the aid of

argument.”). Therefore, to comply with this Court’s standards for acceptable appellate practice, Petitioners responded to the jurisdictional issue comprehensively in their reply—by presenting cogent argument and relevant authority and by submitting exhibits—even though the jurisdictional issue was not raised properly or presented adequately with cogent argument by counsel for Plaintiff Senators. As explained in Petitioners’ reply, the suggestion of lack of jurisdiction has no merit. (*Reply 1-7.*)

Nevertheless, to remove any and all doubts regarding its authorization, the Legislative Commission adopted and approved the resolution at its meeting on February 6, 2020, and thereby ratified its authorization of this mandamus action on behalf of Petitioners. Under the ordinary rules of ratification, “[a] legislative body may ratify any action that it had the power to authorize in advance and the ratification dates back to the action that was ratified.” Mason’s Manual of Legislative Procedure § 146(6) (2010); Casamasino v. City of Jersey City, 730 A.2d 287, 293 (N.J. 1999) (explaining that ratification by a public body “is equivalent to an original exercise of power that relates back to the date of the original act or appointment being ratified.”); Houman v. Borough of Pompton Lakes, 382 A.2d 413, 429 (N.J. Super. Ct. Law Div. 1977) (“Whatever a public body may authorize, it may subsequently ratify, and such ratification, being

equivalent to an original grant of power, is operative and relates back to the date of the original action which is subsequently being ratified.”).

Therefore, even if this Court has any doubts regarding the Legislative Commission’s authorization at its meeting on December 30, 2019, the Legislative Commission has removed any and all doubts by adopting and approving the resolution providing for the ratification of its authorization of this mandamus action on behalf of Petitioners. Accordingly, Petitioners ask this Court to grant their motion to supplement the record regarding jurisdictional issues with the attached certified copy of the resolution adopted and approved by the Legislative Commission at its meeting on February 6, 2020.

DATED: This 6th day of February, 2020.

BRENDA J. ERDOES
Legislative Counsel

By: /s/ Kevin C. Powers
KEVIN C. POWERS
Chief Litigation Counsel
Nevada Bar No. 6781
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU, LEGAL DIVISION
401 S. Carson St.
Carson City, NV 89701
Tel: (775) 684-6830; Fax: (775) 684-6761
E-mail: kpowers@lcb.state.nv.us
Attorneys for Petitioners

ADDENDUM

NRS 218F.720 Authority to provide legal representation in actions and proceedings; exemption from fees, costs and expenses; standards and procedures for exercising unconditional right and standing to intervene; payment of costs and expenses of representation.

1. When deemed necessary or advisable to protect the official interests of the Legislature in any action or proceeding, the Legislative Commission, or the Chair of the Legislative Commission in cases where action is required before a meeting of the Legislative Commission is scheduled to be held, may direct the Legislative Counsel and the Legal Division to appear in, commence, prosecute, defend or intervene in any action or proceeding before any court, agency or officer of the United States, this State or any other jurisdiction, or any political subdivision thereof. In any such action or proceeding, the Legislature may not be assessed or held liable for:

- (a) Any filing or other court or agency fees; or
- (b) The attorney's fees or any other fees, costs or expenses of any other parties.

2. If a party to any action or proceeding before any court, agency or officer:

(a) Alleges that the Legislature, by its actions or failure to act, has violated the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States or the Constitution or laws of this State; or

(b) Challenges, contests or raises as an issue, either in law or in equity, in whole or in part, or facially or as applied, the meaning, intent, purpose, scope, applicability, validity, enforceability or constitutionality of any law, resolution, initiative, referendum or other legislative or constitutional measure, including, without limitation, on grounds that it is ambiguous, unclear, uncertain, imprecise, indefinite or vague, is preempted by federal law or is otherwise inapplicable, invalid, unenforceable or unconstitutional,

⇒ the Legislature may elect to intervene in the action or proceeding by filing a motion or request to intervene in the form required by the rules, laws or regulations applicable to the action or proceeding. The motion or request to intervene must be accompanied by an appropriate pleading, brief or dispositive motion setting forth the Legislature's arguments, claims, objections or defenses, in law or fact, or by a motion or request to file such a pleading, brief or dispositive motion at a later time.

3. Notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, upon the filing of a motion or request to intervene pursuant to subsection 2, the Legislature has an unconditional right and standing to intervene in the action or proceeding and to present its arguments, claims, objections or defenses, in law or fact, whether or not the Legislature's interests are adequately represented by existing parties and

whether or not the State or any agency, officer or employee of the State is an existing party. If the Legislature intervenes in the action or proceeding, the Legislature has all the rights of a party.

4. The provisions of this section do not make the Legislature a necessary or indispensable party to any action or proceeding unless the Legislature intervenes in the action or proceeding, and no party to any action or proceeding may name the Legislature as a party or move to join the Legislature as a party based on the provisions of this section.

5. The Legislative Commission may authorize payment of the expenses and costs incurred pursuant to this section from the Legislative Fund.

6. As used in this section:

(a) "Action or proceeding" means any action, suit, matter, cause, hearing, appeal or proceeding.

(b) "Agency" means any agency, office, department, division, bureau, unit, board, commission, authority, institution, committee, subcommittee or other similar body or entity, including, without limitation, any body or entity created by an interstate, cooperative, joint or interlocal agreement or compact.

(c) "Legislature" means:

(1) The Legislature or either House; or

(2) Any current or former agency, member, officer or employee of the Legislature, the Legislative Counsel Bureau or the Legislative Department.

(Added to NRS by 1965, 1461; A 1971, 1546; 1995, 1108; 1999, 2203; 2007, 3305; 2009, 1565; 2011, 3244)—(Substituted in revision for NRS 218.697)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau, Legal Division, and that on the 6th day of February, 2020, pursuant to NRAP 25 and the parties' stipulation and consent to service by electronic mail, I served a true and correct copy of the Petitioners' Motion to Supplement Record Regarding Jurisdictional Issues and attached supplemental exhibit, as follows:

By means of the Nevada Supreme Court's electronic filing system directed to:

KAREN A. PETERSON, ESQ.
JUSTIN TOWNSEND, ESQ.
ALLISON MACKENZIE, LTD.
402 N. Division St.
Carson City, NV 89703
kpeterston@allisonmackenzie.com
jtownsend@allisonmackenzie.com
Attorneys for All Real Parties in Interest and All Other Plaintiffs in the District Court Proceedings

By United States Mail, postage prepaid, directed to:

HONORABLE JAMES T. RUSSELL
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
885 E. Musser St. Room 3061
Carson City, NV 89701
Respondent District Judge

By electronic mail directed to:

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General
CRAIG A. NEWBY
Deputy Solicitor General
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
100 N. Carson St.
Carson City, NV 89701
CNewby@ag.nv.gov
*Attorneys for All Executive Defendants in the District Court Proceedings:
State of Nevada ex rel. Governor Steve Sisolak, Lieutenant Governor Kate Marshall, Nevada Department of Taxation and Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles*

/s/ Kevin C. Powers
An Employee of the Legislative Counsel Bureau

**PETITIONERS' MOTION
TO SUPPLEMENT RECORD
REGARDING JURISDICTIONAL
ISSUES**

**SUPPLEMENTAL
EXHIBIT 1**

**RESOLUTION OF
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION**



**THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

In the Matter of Litigation in the Cases of
Settlemeyer v. State of Nevada, Case No. 19-
OC-00127-1B, First Judicial District Court,
Carson City, and *State ex rel. Cannizzaro v.*
First Judicial District Court, Case No. 80313,
Nevada Supreme Court.

**RESOLUTION OF THE
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION**

WHEREAS, At the meeting of the Legislative Commission held on December 30, 2019, the Chief
Litigation Counsel of the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (Legal Division) provided a
litigation report on the status of the case of *Settlemeyer v. State of Nevada*, Case No. 19-OC-00127-1B,
First Judicial District Court, Carson City; and

WHEREAS, The Chief Litigation Counsel reported that the plaintiffs are challenging the
constitutionality of Senate Bill No. 542 and Senate Bill No. 551 of the 2019 Legislative Session under
the two-thirds majority requirement in Article 4, Section 18 of the Nevada Constitution, and that the
plaintiffs include eight members of the Senate—the Plaintiff Senators—who voted against the bills; and

WHEREAS, The Chief Litigation Counsel reported that the plaintiffs named several state officers
and agencies of the executive and legislative branches as defendants in their official capacity, including
the Legislative Defendants—Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, in her official capacity as the Senate
Majority Leader; and Claire J. Clift, in her official capacity as the Secretary of the Senate; and

1 WHEREAS, The Chief Litigation Counsel reported that from the onset of this case, the Legislative
2 Defendants have been represented in their official capacity by the Legal Division as their statutorily
3 authorized counsel pursuant to NRS 218F.720; and

4 WHEREAS, The Chief Litigation Counsel reported that on December 19, 2019, the district court
5 entered an order which granted the motion of the Plaintiff Senators to disqualify the Legal Division from
6 representing the Legislative Defendants in their official capacity pursuant to NRS 218F.720 and required
7 those defendants to obtain separate outside counsel to represent them in their official capacity; and

8 WHEREAS, The Chief Litigation Counsel explained that the district court's order disqualifying the
9 Legal Division from representing the Legislative Defendants in their official capacity would be binding
10 on the Legal Division unless appellate review of the disqualification order was sought by filing a
11 petition for writ of mandamus with the Nevada Supreme Court; and

12 WHEREAS, The Chief Litigation Counsel presented an item for consideration and action by the
13 Legislative Commission as follows: "The item would be that to protect the official interests of the
14 Legislature, the Legislative Commission directs the Legislative Counsel and LCB Legal [Division]
15 under NRS 218F.720 to take all actions necessary to seek, commence, prosecute a mandamus appellate
16 review action in the Nevada Supreme Court to seek appellate review of the district court's
17 disqualification order in the case of *Settelmeyer v. State*."; and

18 WHEREAS, After consideration and discussion, the Legislative Commission approved a motion to
19 direct the Legal Division to take whatever legal action necessary to represent the Legislature in this
20 action as set forth by the Chief Litigation Counsel; and

21 WHEREAS, Because the Legislative Commission approved the motion which expressly
22 incorporated the action item as set forth by the Chief Litigation Counsel, the Legislative Commission
23 clearly approved the action item and authorized the Legal Division pursuant to NRS 218F.720 to take all
24 actions necessary to seek, commence and prosecute a mandamus appellate review action in the Nevada

1 Supreme Court to seek appellate review of the district court's disqualification order in the case of
2 *Settelmeyer v. State of Nevada*; and

3 WHEREAS, On January 3, 2020, the Legal Division filed a petition for writ of mandamus in the
4 case of *State ex rel. Cannizzaro v. First Judicial District Court*, Case No. 80313, Nevada Supreme
5 Court, on behalf of the following petitioners—State of Nevada ex rel. Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, in
6 her official capacity as the Senate Majority Leader; Claire J. Clift, in her official capacity as the
7 Secretary of the Senate; the Legal Division, in its official capacity as the legal agency of the Legislative
8 Department; Brenda J. Erdoes, Esq., in her official capacity as Legislative Counsel and Chief of the
9 Legal Division and in her professional capacity as an attorney and licensed member of the State Bar of
10 Nevada; and Kevin C. Powers, Esq., in his official capacity as Chief Litigation Counsel of the Legal
11 Division and in his professional capacity as an attorney and licensed member of the State Bar of
12 Nevada; and

13 WHEREAS, On January 24, 2020, in their answer to the petition for writ of mandamus, the Plaintiff
14 Senators suggested that the mandamus appellate review action filed on behalf of the petitioners has
15 potential jurisdictional defects due to improper authorization by the Legislative Commission at the
16 meeting held on December 30, 2019; and

17 WHEREAS, On January 31, 2020, the petitioners, in their reply to the answer, responded to the
18 jurisdictional issues by arguing that, at the meeting held on December 30, 2019, the Legislative
19 Commission clearly approved the action item as set forth by the Chief Litigation Counsel and authorized
20 the Legal Division pursuant to NRS 218F.720 to seek, commence and prosecute the mandamus appellate
21 review action filed on behalf of the petitioners; and

22 WHEREAS, Under well-established rules of law, “[a] legislative body may ratify any action that it
23 had the power to authorize in advance and the ratification dates back to the action that was ratified.”
24 (*Mason’s Manual of Legislative Procedure* § 146(6) (2010)); now, therefore, be it

1 RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, That by means of this
2 resolution and for the purpose of removing any doubts regarding its authorization, the Legislative
3 Commission hereby ratifies its approval of the action item as set forth by the Chief Litigation Counsel at
4 the meeting held on December 30, 2019, which authorized the Legal Division pursuant to
5 NRS 218F.720 to seek, commence and prosecute the mandamus appellate review action filed on behalf
6 of the petitioners, and hereby ratifies the petition for writ of mandamus filed on behalf of the petitioners
7 and all other actions taken by the Legal Division on behalf of the petitioners in the case of *State ex rel.*
8 *Cannizzaro v. First Judicial District Court*; and be it further

9 RESOLVED, That the Legislative Commission's ratification in this resolution relates back to the
10 date of its approval of the action item as set forth by the Chief Litigation Counsel at the meeting held on
11 December 30, 2019, which authorized the Legal Division pursuant to NRS 218F.720 to seek, commence
12 and prosecute the mandamus appellate review action filed on behalf of the petitioners in the case of
13 *State ex rel. Cannizzaro v. First Judicial District Court*.

14 PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED on this 6th day of February 2020.

15 **LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION OF**
16 **THE STATE OF NEVADA**

17 By: _____


SENATOR JULIA RATTI

Vice Chair of the Legislative Commission

19 ATTEST:

20 
21 **MARK KRMPOTIC**

22 Acting Secretary of the Legislative Commission
23
24



**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU
OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

In the Matter of Litigation in the Cases of *Settelmeyer v. State of Nevada*, Case No. 19-OC-00127-1B, First Judicial District Court, Carson City, and *State ex rel. Cannizzaro v. First Judicial District Court*, Case No. 80313, Nevada Supreme Court.

DECLARATION AND CERTIFICATION REGARDING RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

STATE OF NEVADA)
)
COUNTY OF CARSON) **ss.**

Pursuant to NRS 53.045, Brenda J. Erdoes, Esq., declares under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of Nevada that the following is true and correct:

1. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration and certification, and I am competent to testify regarding the matters set forth in this declaration and certification.

2. I am an attorney admitted to practice law in the State of Nevada, and I am a licensed member of the State Bar of Nevada.

3. Pursuant to Nevada's laws and rules governing the Legislative Department of the State Government (Legislative Department), I am the Legislative Counsel of the State of Nevada appointed pursuant to NRS 218F.100, and I am the Chief of the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) pursuant to that statute.

1 4. Pursuant to Nevada's laws and rules governing the Legislative Department, the Legislative
2 Commission of the State of Nevada (Legislative Commission) held a public meeting on February 6,
3 2020 (February 6 meeting), at the following locations through a simultaneous videoconference:

4 (a) Legislative Building, Room 4100, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

5 (b) Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4401, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas,
6 Nevada.

7 5. Pursuant to Nevada's laws and rules governing the Legislative Department, in my official
8 capacity as the Legislative Counsel and Chief of the Legal Division of the LCB, I am authorized to
9 make this declaration and certification, and I hereby declare and certify that:

10 (a) I personally attended the February 6 meeting of the Legislative Commission.

11 (b) At the February 6 meeting, the Legislative Commission considered a resolution entitled:

12 In the Matter of Litigation in the Cases of *Settelmeyer v. State of Nevada*, Case No. 19-OC-
13 00127-1B, First Judicial District Court, Carson City, and *State ex rel. Cannizzaro v. First*
Judicial District Court, Case No. 80313, Nevada Supreme Court.

14 (c) At the February 6 meeting, the Legislative Commission passed, approved and adopted the
15 resolution in the manner required by the laws and rules governing the Legislative Department.

16 (d) The resolution is an official record kept by the LCB in the performance of its official duties
17 for the Legislative Department.

18 (e) This declaration and certification is attached to a true and correct copy of the resolution as
19 passed, approved and adopted by the Legislative Commission at the February 6 meeting and kept as an
20 official record by the LCB in the performance of its official duties for the Legislative Department.

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

1 Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of Nevada
2 that the foregoing is true and correct.

3 EXECUTED ON: This 6th day of February 2020.

4
5 By: 

BRENDA J. ERDOES

Legislative Counsel

Nevada Bar No. 3644

7 LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU, LEGAL DIVISION

401 S. Carson St.

8 Carson City, NV 89701

9 Tel: (775) 684-6830; Fax: (775) 684-6761
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24