

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP  
LLC, a Delaware limited liability  
company; and LAS VEGAS  
REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware corporation,

Appellants/Cross-  
Respondents

v.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

Respondent/Cross-  
Appellant.

Supreme Court No. 80511

Electronically Filed  
Jun 01 2020 10:22 p.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

**APPELLANTS/CROSS-RESPONDENTS' APPENDIX**  
**VOL. 5**

---

Appeal from the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of  
Nevada in and for the County of Clark  
The Honorable Timothy Williams  
District Court Case No: A-18-772591-B

---

KEMP JONES, LLP  
J. Randall Jones (#1927)  
Michael J. Gayan (#11135)  
Mona Kaveh (#11825)  
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy,  
17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
Richard L. Stone (*pro hac vice*)  
David R. Singer (*pro hac vice*)  
Amy M. Gallegos (*pro hac vice*)  
633 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
*Attorneys for Appellants/Cross-  
Respondents*

**APPELLANTS' APPENDIX  
ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date Filed</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol.</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
05/07/2018	Complaint (Excluding Exhibits), Las Vegas Sun, Inc. v. DR Partners, Case No. A-15-715008-BXI, attached as Exhibit A to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss	I	105-112
03/03/2020	Defendants' Amended Notice of Appeal in Appellate Court (Including Exhibits and Case Appeal Statement)	VI	1030-1183
02/28/2020	Defendants' Amended Notice of Appeal in State Court (Including Exhibits)	V	994-1029
12/14/2018	Defendants' Answer to First Amended Complaint	I	117-146
09/30/2019	Defendants' First Amended Answer to Complaint and Counterclaims	II	292-334
09/19/2019	Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award and Declaration of Michael Gayan in support, with Exhibits A-D [Filed Under Seal/Portions Redacted]: A. 2005 Joint Operating Arrangement B. Stephens Media profit and loss statement (Arbitration Ex. 77) [Filed Under Seal] C. Final Award of Arbitrator [Filed Under Seal] D. 1989 Joint Operating Arrangement	II	179-291

01/31/2020	Defendants' Notice of Appeal in Appellate Court (Including Exhibits and Case Appeal Statement)	V	845-974
01/28/2020	Defendants' Notice of Appeal in State Court (Including Exhibits)	V	821-844
09/30/2019	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (Excluding Exhibits) [Filed Under Seal]	II	335-359
10/14/2019	Defendants' Reply in Support of Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part	III	552-555
10/11/2019	Defendants' Reply in Support of Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (Including Exhibits E-H, Excluding Exhibits A-B) [Filed Under Seal/Portions Redacted, Exhibits Filed Under Seal]	III	406-473
01/28/2020	Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order Affirming the Arbitration Award	V	810-820
05/22/2020	Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Seal All Materials	VII	1303-1319

	Generated in the Private Arbitration		
02/18/2020	Judgment	V	991-993
12/04/2019	Minute Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award and Granting the Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part	V	804-809
05/01/2020	Minute Order re: Motion to Seal	VII	1299-1302
10/22/2019	Minute Order re Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Defendant's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award	III	556
11/21/2018	Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss	I	115-116
04/19/2018	Plaintiff's Affidavit of Service re: Summons and Complaint to Defendant Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc.	I	103
04/19/2018	Plaintiff's Affidavit of Service re: Summons and Complaint to Defendant News+Media Capital Group, LLC	I	104
04/10/2018	Plaintiff's Complaint (Including Exhibits)	I	1-102
11/15/2019	Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (Including Exhibits)	IV	695-803
09/13/2019	Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or,	I	147-178



	Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Excluding Exhibits) [Filed Under Seal]		
03/19/2020	Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal in Appellate Court (Including Exhibits and Case Appeal Statement)	VII	1184-1298
02/11/2020	Plaintiff's Notice of Cross-Appeal in State Court (Including Exhibits)	V	975-990
09/30/2019	Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (Including Exhibits) [Filed Under Seal/Portions Redacted, Exhibits Filed Under Seal]	II	360-405
10/11/2019	Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate the Award, in Part (Including Exhibits) [Filed Under Seal/Portions Redacted, Exhibits 3-6 Filed Under Seal]	III	474-551
05/07/2018	Stipulation and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice, Las Vegas Sun, Inc. v. DR Partners, Case No. A-15-715008-BXI, attached as Exhibit B to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss	I	113-114
10/22/2019	Transcript of Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part,	IV	557-694

	and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award		
--	--	--	--

**APPELLANTS' APPENDIX  
CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date Filed</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol.</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
04/10/2018	Plaintiff's Complaint (Including Exhibits)	I	1-102
04/19/2018	Plaintiff's Affidavit of Service re: Summons and Complaint to Defendant Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc.	I	103
04/19/2018	Plaintiff's Affidavit of Service re: Summons and Complaint to Defendant News+Media Capital Group, LLC	I	104
05/07/2018	Complaint (Excluding Exhibits), Las Vegas Sun, Inc. v. DR Partners, Case No. A- 15-715008-BXI, attached as Exhibit A to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss	I	105-112
05/07/2018	Stipulation and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice, Las Vegas Sun, Inc. v. DR Partners, Case No. A-15- 715008-BXI, attached as Exhibit B to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss	I	113-114
11/21/2018	Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss	I	115-116
12/14/2018	Defendants' Answer to First Amended Complaint	I	117-146
09/13/2019	Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part	I	147-178

	(Excluding Exhibits) [Filed Under Seal]		
09/19/2019	Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award and Declaration of Michael Gayan in support, with Exhibits A-D [Filed Under Seal/Portions Redacted]: A. 2005 Joint Operating Arrangement B. Stephens Media profit and loss statement (Arbitration Ex. 77) [Filed Under Seal] C. Final Award of Arbitrator [Filed Under Seal] D. 1989 Joint Operating Arrangement	II	179-291
09/30/2019	Defendants' First Amended Answer to Complaint and Counterclaims	II	292-334
09/30/2019	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (Excluding Exhibits) [Filed Under Seal]	II	335-359
09/30/2019	Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (Including Exhibits) [Filed Under Seal/Portions Redacted, Exhibits Filed Under Seal]	II	360-405

10/11/2019	Defendants' Reply in Support of Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (Including Exhibits E-H, Excluding Exhibits A-B) [Filed Under Seal/Portions Redacted, Exhibits Filed Under Seal]	III	406-473
10/11/2019	Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate the Award, in Part (Including Exhibits) [Filed Under Seal/Portions Redacted, Exhibits 3-6 Filed Under Seal]	III	474-551
10/14/2019	Defendants' Reply in Support of Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part	III	552-555
10/22/2019	Minute Order re Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Defendant's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award	III	556
10/22/2019	Transcript of Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award	IV	557-694

11/15/2019	Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (Including Exhibits)	IV	695-803
12/04/2019	Minute Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award and Granting the Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part	V	804-809
01/28/2020	Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order Affirming the Arbitration Award	V	810-820
01/28/2020	Defendants' Notice of Appeal in State Court (Including Exhibits)	V	821-844
01/31/2020	Defendants' Notice of Appeal in Appellate Court (Including Exhibits and Case Appeal Statement)	V	845-974
02/11/2020	Plaintiff's Notice of Cross-Appeal in State Court (Including Exhibits)	V	975-990
02/18/2020	Judgment	V	991-993
02/28/2020	Defendants' Amended Notice of Appeal in State Court (Including Exhibits)	V	994-1029
03/03/2020	Defendants' Amended Notice of Appeal in Appellate Court (Including Exhibits and Case Appeal Statement)	VI	1030-1183
03/19/2020	Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal in Appellate Court (Including Exhibits and Case Appeal Statement)	VII	1184-1298
05/01/2020	Minute Order re: Motion to Seal	VII	1299-1302

05/22/2020	Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Seal All Materials Generated in the Private Arbitration	VII	1303-1319
------------	--	-----	-----------

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 1st day of June, 2020, the foregoing **Appellants’/Cross Respondents’ Appendix – Volume 5** was served electronically with the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Nevada by using the court’s electronic filing system, which will send notice of electronic filing to the following:

**LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER  
CHRISTIE LLP**

E. LEIF REID  
KRISTEN L. MARTINI  
NICOLE SCOTT  
One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, Nevada 89501

**PISANELLI BICE PLLC**

JAMES J. PISANELLI  
TODD L. BICE  
JORDAN T. SMITH  
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

*Attorneys for Respondent/ Cross-Appellant Las Vegas Sun, Inc.*

I further certify that hard copies of the sealed version was served by First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

**LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER  
CHRISTIE LLP**

E. LEIF REID  
KRISTEN L. MARTINI  
NICOLE SCOTT  
One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, Nevada 89501

**PISANELLI BICE PLLC**

JAMES J. PISANELLI  
TODD L. BICE  
JORDAN T. SMITH  
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

*Attorneys for Respondent/ Cross-Appellant Las Vegas Sun, Inc.*

Supreme Court of Nevada  
201 South Carson Street, #201  
Carson City, Nevada 89701

/s/ Angela Embrey  
*An employee of Kemp Jones, LLP*



A-18-772591-B

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**December 04, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**December 04, 2019      5:11 PM      Minute Order: Motions re Arbitration Award**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- After a review and consideration of the points and authorities on file herein, the Court determined as follows:

First, the Court will address collectively Defendant News + Media Capital Group, LLC's and the Review Journal's ("Review Journal") Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and then Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s ("LV Sun") Motion to confirm the Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award in Part.

The first issue raised by the Review Journal as the basis to vacate the Arbitrator's Award, focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the Joint Operating Agreement (JOA) by failing to subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the LV Sun's share of profits under the JOA.

Under Nevada Law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-law ground relied upon for challenging the award." Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White, 133 Nev. 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) quoting Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC, 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004). Additionally, "[t]here are two common-law grounds recognized in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: "(1) whether the award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator manifestly disregarded the law." Id. at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while

PRINT DATE: 12/04/2019

Page 1 of 6

Minutes Date: December 04, 2019

“the latter standard ensures that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law.” Id.

Moreover, “[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is extremely limited.” Id. When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration. Id. Consequently, the Court’s focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the law, but “whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a particular result, simply disregarded the law.” Id.

In the instant action, the Arbitrator recognized the JOA’s plain language, considered its EBITDA, and determined that under the JOA deductions should be calculated for editorial expenses. Thus, there appears to be, at a minimum, a colorable justification for the Arbitrator’s findings on this issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

The term “Retention” was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of “Retention” included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits payments to the Sun.

Arbitrator’s Decision at page 5.

Consequently, the Court finds that the Defendant Review Journal has failed to meet its burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA’s contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

Next, the Arbitrator focused on Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. After he weighed the evidence, he concluded that under his interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator noted:

The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments

to the Sun. There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the “audit” awarded in this matter could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from the RJ’s charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

Arbitrator’s Decision at page 6.

In light of the Arbitrator’s analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA’s contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

Next, the Court reviews Defendant Review Journal’s contentions that the Arbitrator exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation regarding the ordered audit.

In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in Washoe, the Nevada Supreme Court noted:

"The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev., Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular, "[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards outside the scope of the governing contract." *Id.* "However, allegations that an arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator's powers." *Id.* Moreover, "[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement." *Id.* at 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, "[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was correctly decided." *Id.* Therefore, "[a]n award should be enforced so long as the arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract" and "there is a colorable justification for the outcome." *Id.* Nonetheless, "[t]he deference accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express language of the contract." *Int'l Ass'n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

Washoe, 133 Nev. at 304.

It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provide that Plaintiff LV Sun has a right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to "...appoint an certified public accounting firm or law firm as Sun's representative to examine and audit the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments..." (this provision has been referred to by both parties as "audit"). Respondent indicated that an "audit" has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an "audit". In accordance with the scope of this tribunal's authority, Claimant's request for an "audit" is granted. Claimant may undertake the "audit" for the periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018) and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that this award, if an "audit" be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the "audit". This award does not define the scope of the "audit" as part of the award as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal's authority.  
Arbitrator's Decision, page 6.

In review of the Arbitrator's decision, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines. It is clear in review of the Arbitrator's decision he was well aware of the limits of his authority and simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an audit. Thus, a non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate an arbitration decision.

Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court's review of the arbitrary-and- capricious standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in the record. Washoe, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the law." Id.

As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial evidence to support the Arbitrator's Award.

Finally, although the Court has addressed the primary contested issues raised by Defendant Review Journal in its Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, the Court will briefly address the issues raised by the LV Sun.

After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were not additional promotional activities and expenses. The LV Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court Affirms the Arbitrator's ruling.

Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the LV Sun's tortious breach claims. The Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts vs. torts. Further, the Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA that the tort claims potentially applied. Although it's not set forth in detail how the Arbitrator evaluated the party's unique relationship, it appears he determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue, and therefore, he found that the party's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently, the Court cannot find that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the law or the JOA or that the decision was arbitrary and capricious.

Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs, and the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorney's fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his ruling. Accordingly, the Court Affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on costs and fees.

Lastly, the LV Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the Review Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator noted that while the Review Journal has done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an audit, yet he determined that the Review Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

As a result of the foregoing, the Review Journal's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award shall be DENIED. The LV Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part shall be GRANTED in Part and DENIED in Part. The LV Sun's motion is granted as to the request to confirm the Arbitration Award. The LV Sun's motion is denied as to all requests to vacate, modify, or correct the Arbitrator's Award. Lastly, the

Review Journal's Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part shall be GRANTED in Part and DENIED in Part. The Review Journal's countermotion is granted as to the request to confirm the Arbitration Award. The Review Journal's countermotion is denied as to the request to vacate the Arbitration Award.


Lastly, in order to alleviate any potential misunderstanding in light of the confusing procedural posture of the pleadings and request for relief in this case, it is the Court's intention to AFFIRM the entire Arbitration Decision as written.

Counsel for Plaintiff shall prepare a detailed Order, Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law, based not only on the foregoing Minute Order, but also on the record on file herein. This is to be submitted to adverse counsel for review and approval and/or submission of a competing Order or objections, prior to submitting to the Court for review and signature.

CLERK'S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
 Seventeenth Floor  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 (702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
 kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
 1/28/2020 4:52 PM  
 Steven D. Grierson  
 CLERK OF THE COURT



J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
 r.jones@kempjones.com  
 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
 m.gayan@kempjones.com  
 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
 m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 rstone@jenner.com  
 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 dsinger@jenner.com  
 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 agallegos@jenner.com  
 JENNER & BLOCK  
 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**  
**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
 corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
 Delaware limited liability company; and  
 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
 Delaware limited liability company,

Defendants.

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
 Delaware corporation,

Counterclaimant,

v.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
 corporation,

Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
 Dept. No.: 16

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF  
 FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND  
 ORDER AFFIRMING THE  
 ARBITRATION AWARD**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the **FINDINGS OF**  
2 **FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION**  
3 **AWARD** was entered in the above-entitled matter on January 28, 2020, a copy of which is  
4 attached hereto.

5 DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

6 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

7  
8 /s/ Michael Gayan

9 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
10 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
11 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
12 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

14 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
15 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
16 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
17 JENNER & BLOCK  
18 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
19 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

20 *Attorneys for Defendants*


21 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

22 I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of  
23 the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF**  
24 **LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION AWARD** via the Court's  
25 electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules,  
26 Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

27 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

28 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP





KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**

14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
16 corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B

Dept. No.: XVI

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD**

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.’s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.’s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.’s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 “Motions”).

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.’s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the “JOA”).

15 ***The Sun’s Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the “Review-Journal”) in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun’s motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 ***The Arbitration Award***

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 ***The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award***

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 ***The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award***

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial

1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
13 the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
14 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
15 There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
16 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
17 expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las*  
15 *Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious

1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 ***The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,***  
9 ***Modify or Correct the Award, in Part***

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.








KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.


6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams

9 Submitted by:

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11  
12 Madeira Z Vela #13626  
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18 *Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13  
14 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
15 corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
19 Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
21 Delaware limited liability company,

22 Defendants.

23 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
24 Delaware corporation,

25 Counterclaimant,

26 v.

27 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
28 corporation,

Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC  
AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL,  
INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kic@kempjones.com

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC and Defendant/Counterclaimant Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc. hereby appeal to the Supreme Court of Nevada from the Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, filed on January 28, 2020 (the "Order"), in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. The Notice of Entry of Order was filed and served on January 28, 2020, and is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

/s/ J. Randall Jones

J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

*Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL** via the Court's electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.


/s/ Pamela Montgomery

An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP

# **EXHIBIT 1**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
1/28/2020 4:43 PM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13  
14 **DISTRICT COURT**  
15  
16 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

17 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
18 corporation,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
22 a Delaware limited liability company; and  
23 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
24 a Delaware limited liability company,

25 Defendants.

26 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
27 a Delaware corporation,

28 Counterclaimant,

v.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 "Motions").

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

### 12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the "JOA").

#### 15 ***The Sun's Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the "Review-Journal") in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun's motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 *The Arbitration Award*

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 *The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award*

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 *The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award*

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial



1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
13 the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
14 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
15 There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
16 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
17 expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las  
15 Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious

1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 *The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,*  
9 *Modify or Correct the Award, in Part*

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.

1           28.     Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs and  
2 the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorneys'  
3 fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of  
4 the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a  
5 consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds  
6 that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his  
7 ruling. Accordingly, the Court affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on attorneys' fees and costs.

8           29.     Lastly, the Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the  
9 Review-Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator determined that the  
10 Review-Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered  
11 that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

12                               **ORDER**

13           IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Arbitration  
14 Award is confirmed in its entirety.

15           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the  
16 Arbitration Award is DENIED.

17           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm  
18 Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in  
19 Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED  
20 IN PART as provided for herein.

21     ///

22  
23  
24  
25     ///

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway

Seventeenth Floor



Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kjc@kempjones.com


1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.

6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams  
9 

10 Submitted by:

11 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

12  #13626

13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)

14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)


15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)

16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor

17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18 *Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

## **EXHIBIT 2**



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kic@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13  
14 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
15 corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
19 Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
23 Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
27 corporation,

28 Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: 16

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF  
FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND  
ORDER AFFIRMING THE  
ARBITRATION AWARD**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kic@kempjones.com

1 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the **FINDINGS OF**  
2 **FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION**  
3 **AWARD** was entered in the above-entitled matter on January 28, 2020, a copy of which is  
4 attached hereto.

5 DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

6 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

7  
8 /s/ Michael Gayan

9 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
10 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
11 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
12 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

14 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
15 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
16 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
17 JENNER & BLOCK  
18 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
19 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

20 *Attorneys for Defendants*


21 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

22 I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of  
23 the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF**  
24 **LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION AWARD** via the Court's  
25 electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules,  
26 Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

27 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

28 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP





KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**

14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
16 corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD**

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 "Motions").

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

#### 12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the "JOA").

#### 15 ***The Sun's Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the "Review-Journal") in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun's motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 ***The Arbitration Award***

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 ***The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award***

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 ***The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award***

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial

1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
13 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
14 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
15 of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
16 the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

17  
18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las  
15 Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint a certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious



1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 ***The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,***  
9 ***Modify or Correct the Award, in Part***

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.

1           28.     Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs and  
2 the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorneys'  
3 fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of  
4 the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a  
5 consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds  
6 that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his  
7 ruling. Accordingly, the Court affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on attorneys' fees and costs.

8           29.     Lastly, the Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the  
9 Review-Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator determined that the  
10 Review-Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered  
11 that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

12                               **ORDER**

13           IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Arbitration  
14 Award is confirmed in its entirety.

15           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the  
16 Arbitration Award is DENIED.

17           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm  
18 Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in  
19 Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED  
20 IN PART as provided for herein.

21     ///


22  
23  
24  
25     ///



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com


1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.

6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams

9 Submitted by:

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11  
12  #13626  
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18 *Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Electronically Filed  
1/28/2020 5:00 PM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



Electronically Filed  
Jan 31 2020 11:06 a.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13  
14 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
15 corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
19 Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
21 Delaware limited liability company,

22 Defendants.

23 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
24 Delaware corporation,

25 Counterclaimant,

26 v.

27 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
28 corporation,

Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC  
AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL,  
INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC and Defendant/Counterclaimant Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc. hereby appeal to the Supreme Court of Nevada from the Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, filed on January 28, 2020 (the "Order"), in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. The Notice of Entry of Order was filed and served on January 28, 2020, and is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

/s/ J. Randall Jones

J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

*Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL** via the Court's electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

/s/ Pamela Montgomery

An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP

## **EXHIBIT 1**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway


Seventeenth Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
1/28/2020 4:43 PM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com

10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**

14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
16 corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 "Motions").

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the "JOA").

15 ***The Sun's Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the "Review-Journal") in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun's motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of  
26

27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the "Award").

2 *The Arbitration Award*

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator's rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun's requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun's breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun's claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties' requests for an award of attorneys' fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 *The Parties' Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award*

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the "Sun's  
14 Motion").

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun's  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties' motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties' motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court's review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 *The RJ's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award*

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial



1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
13 the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
14 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
15 There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
16 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
17 expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las  
15 Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious

1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 *The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,*  
9 *Modify or Correct the Award, in Part*

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.

1           28.     Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs and  
2 the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorneys'  
3 fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of  
4 the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a  
5 consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds  
6 that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his  
7 ruling. Accordingly, the Court affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on attorneys' fees and costs.

8           29.     Lastly, the Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the  
9 Review-Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator determined that the  
10 Review-Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered  
11 that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

12                               **ORDER**

13           IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Arbitration  
14 Award is confirmed in its entirety.

15           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the  
16 Arbitration Award is DENIED.

17           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm  
18 Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in  
19 Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED  
20 IN PART as provided for herein.

21     ///

22  
23  
24  
25     ///  
26  
27  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway

Seventeenth Floor


Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kjc@kempjones.com


1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2020.

6  
7  
8   
The Honorable Timothy C. Williams


9 Submitted by:

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11  
12  #13626  
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

16 Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## **EXHIBIT 2**



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kic@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13  
14 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
15 corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
19 Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
23 Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
27 corporation,

28 Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: 16

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF  
FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND  
ORDER AFFIRMING THE  
ARBITRATION AWARD**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the **FINDINGS OF**  
2 **FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION**  
3 **AWARD** was entered in the above-entitled matter on January 28, 2020, a copy of which is  
4 attached hereto.

5 DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

6 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

7  
8 /s/ Michael Gayan

9 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
10 Michael J. Gayan, Esq., (#11135)  
11 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
12 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

14 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
15 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
16 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
17 JENNER & BLOCK  
18 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
19 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

20 *Attorneys for Defendants*

21 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

22 I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of  
23 the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF**  
24 **LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION AWARD** via the Court's  
25 electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules,  
26 Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

27 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

28 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP



*Steven D. Grierson*

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**  
14  
15 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

16 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD**

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 "Motions").

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

#### 12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the "JOA").

#### 15 ***The Sun's Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the "Review-Journal") in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun's motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 ***The Arbitration Award***

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 ***The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award***

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 ***The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award***

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial

1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
13 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
14 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
15 of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
16 the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

17  
18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las  
15 Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious

1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 *The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,*  
9 *Modify or Correct the Award, in Part*

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.

1           28.     Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs and  
2 the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorneys'  
3 fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of  
4 the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a  
5 consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds  
6 that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his  
7 ruling. Accordingly, the Court affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on attorneys' fees and costs.

8           29.     Lastly, the Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the  
9 Review-Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator determined that the  
10 Review-Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered  
11 that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

12                               **ORDER**

13           IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Arbitration  
14 Award is confirmed in its entirety.

15           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the  
16 Arbitration Award is DENIED.

17           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm  
18 Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in  
19 Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED  
20 IN PART as provided for herein.

21     ///


22  
23  
24  
25     ///  
26  
27  
28



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.

6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams

9 Submitted by:


10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11  
12 Madeira Z Vela #13626  
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18 *Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
 Seventeenth Floor  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 (702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
 kic@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
 1/28/2020 5:02 PM  
 Steven D. Grierson  
 CLERK OF THE COURT



1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
 r.jones@kempjones.com  
 2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
 m.gayan@kempjones.com  
 3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
 m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
 4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
 6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 rstone@jenner.com  
 8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 dsinger@jenner.com  
 9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 agallegos@jenner.com  
 10 JENNER & BLOCK  
 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
 11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

14 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
 15 corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
 19 Delaware limited liability company; and  
 20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
 Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
 23 Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
 27 corporation,

28 Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
 Dept. No.: XVI

**NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC  
 AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL,  
 INC.'S CASE APPEAL STATEMENT**

1 Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC and Defendant/Counterclaimant Las Vegas  
2 Review-Journal, Inc., by and through their counsel of record, Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP,  
3 and Jenner & Block, hereby file this Case Appeal Statement regarding their Notice of Appeal  
4 pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 3(f):

5 **1. Name of appellants filing this Case Appeal Statement:**

6 News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.

7 **2. Identify the judge issuing the decision, judgment or order appealed from:**

8 Honorable District Court Judge Timothy C. Williams, Eighth Judicial District Court,  
9 Clark County, Nevada

10 **3. Identify each appellant and the name and address of counsel for each**  
11 **appellant:**

12 News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.

13 Represented by: J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
16 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

17 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
18 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
19 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, California 90071-2054

20  
21 **4. Identify each respondent and the name and address of appellate counsel, if**  
22 **known, for each respondent (if the name of a respondent's appellate counsel is unknown,**  
23 **provide the name and address of that respondent's trial counsel):**

24 Las Vegas Sun, Inc.

25 Represented by: E. Leif Reed, Esq. (#5750)  
26 Kristen L. Martini, Esq. (#11272)  
27 Nicole Scott, Esq. (#13757)  
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP  
One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
28 Reno, Nevada 89501-2128

James J. Pisanelli, Esq. (#4027)  
Todd L. Bice, Esq. (#4534)  
Jordan T. Smith, Esq. (#12097)  
PISANELLI BICE PLLC  
400 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

5. **Indicate whether any attorney identified above in response to question 3 or 4 is not licensed to practice law in Nevada, and if so, whether the district court granted that attorney permission to appear under SCR 42 (attach a copy of any district court order granting such permission):**

Richard L. Stone, Esq., David R. Singer, Esq., and Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. were granted permission to appear before the district court under SCR 42. The Orders granting such permission are attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

6. **Indicate whether appellant was represented by appointed or retained counsel in the district court:**

News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc. were represented by retained counsel in the district court.

7. **Indicate whether appellant is represented by appointed or retained counsel on appeal:**

News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc. are represented by retained counsel on appeal.

8. **Indicate whether appellant was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and if so, the date of the district court's order granting such leave:**

News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc. did not request and was not granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

9. **Indicate the date that the proceedings commenced in the district court (e.g., date complaint, indictment, information, or petition was filed):**

Las Vegas Sun, Inc. filed its Complaint in the district court on April 10, 2018.

1           **10. Provide a brief description of the nature of the action and result in the**  
2 **district court, including the type of judgment or order being appealed and the relief**  
3 **granted by the district court:**

4           On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) and Defendant Las Vegas  
5 Review-Journal, Inc.’s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the “JOA”). On  
6 April 10, 2018, the Sun filed a Complaint against News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
7 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc. (collectively, “Review-Journal”) regarding disputes related to the  
8 JOA, and moved the district court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims in the  
9 Complaint. The district court granted the Sun’s motion to compel arbitration via an order  
10 entered on November 21, 2018. The Arbitrator issued a Final Award of Arbitrator dated July 2,  
11 2019 (the “Award”). The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and  
12 requests for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of  
13 various JOA provisions (i.e., Appendix D, Section 4.2 and Section 5.1.4); (b) the Sun’s breach  
14 of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim for tortious  
15 breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same sections of  
16 the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs related to the  
17 arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various motions to  
18 seal pending before the district court.

19           On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part,  
20 and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s Motion”). On  
21 September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award. On  
22 September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s Motion along with a  
23 Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in  
24 Part. On December 4, 2019, the district court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
25 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
26 submit a more detailed order containing findings of fact and conclusions of law for the district  
27 court’s review and signature. On January 28, 2020, the district court entered its Findings of  
28 Facts, Conclusions of Law, And Order Affirming the Arbitration Award (“Order”), with the

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 Notice of Entry of Order being filed on January 28, 2020. Pursuant to NRS 38.247, the Review-  
2 Journal filed its Notice of Appeal of the Order on January 28, 2020.

3 **11. Indicate whether the case has previously been the subject of an appeal to or**  
4 **original writ proceeding in the Supreme Court or Court of Appeals and, if so, the caption**  
5 **and docket number of the prior proceeding:**

6 This case has not previously been the subject of an appeal to or original writ proceeding  
7 in the Supreme Court or Court of Appeals.

8 **12. Indicate whether this appeal involves child custody or visitation:**

9 This appeal does not involve child custody or visitation.

10 **13. If this is a civil case, indicate whether this appeal involves the possibility of**  
11 **settlement:**

12 This appeal involves the possibility of settlement.

13 DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

14 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

15  
16 /s/ J. Randall Jones

17 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
18 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
19 Mona Kavch, Esq., (#11825)  
20 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
21 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

22 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
23 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
24 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
25 JENNER & BLOCK  
26 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
27 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

28 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S CASE APPEAL STATEMENT** via the Court's electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

/s/ Pamela Montgomery

An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP

## **EXHIBIT 1**



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway


Seventeenth Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
9/26/2019 10:54 AM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**

14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
16 corporation,

17 **Plaintiff,**

18 **v.**

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
20 a Delaware limited liability company; and  
21 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

22 **Defendants.**  
23  
24

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER  
ADMITTING TO PRACTICE (RICHARD  
LEE STONE, ESQ.)**

25 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an **ORDER**  
26 **ADMITTING TO PRACTICE (RICHARD LEE STONE, ESQ.)** was entered in the above

27 **///**  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 entitled matter on September 25, 2019, a copy of which is attached hereto.

2 DATED this 26th day of September, 2019.

3 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

4  
5 /s/ Michael Gayan

6 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
7 Michael J. Gayan, Esq., (#11135)  
8 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
9 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

11 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
12 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
13 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
14 JENNER & BLOCK  
15 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
16 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

17 *Attorneys for Defendants*

18 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**


19 I hereby certify that on the 26th day of September, 2019, I served a true and correct copy  
20 of the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE**  
21 **(RICHARD LEE STONE, ESQ.)** via the Court's electronic filing system only, pursuant to the  
22 Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties  
23 currently on the electronic service list.

24  
25 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

26 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP  
27  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
9/25/2019 3:00 PM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
JENNER & BLOCK, LLP  
9 633 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
10 Telephone: (213) 239-2206  
*Attorneys for Defendants*

11 **DISTRICT COURT**

12 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
14 corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
18 a Delaware limited liability company; and  
19 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
20 a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.  
22

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

23 **ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE**  
24 **(RICHARD LEE STONE, ESQ.)**

25 **RICHARD LEE STONE, ESQ.**, having filed his Motion to Associate Counsel under  
26 Nevada Supreme Court Rule 42, together with a Verified Application for Association of  
27 Counsel, a Certificate of Good Standing for the State of California, and the State Bar of Nevada  
28 Statement; said application having been noticed, no objections having been made, and the Court  
being fully apprised in the premises, and good cause appearing, it is hereby

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway

Seventeenth Floor


Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kjc@kempjones.com


1           **ORDERED**, that said application is hereby granted, and **RICHARD LEE STONE**,  
2 **ESQ.**, is hereby admitted to practice in the above entitled Court for the purposed of the above  
3 entitled matter only.

4           DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2019.

5  
6   
7 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE  
8

9 Respectfully submitted,

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11   
12 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
13 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
14 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
15 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

17 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
18 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
19 David R. Singer, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
20 JENNER & BLOCK, LLP  
21 633 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
22 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
23 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP


3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kic@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
9/26/2019 10:54 AM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

13 DISTRICT COURT  
14 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

15 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
16 corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
20 a Delaware limited liability company; and  
21 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

22 Defendants.  
23  
24

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER  
ADMITTING TO PRACTICE (DAVID  
RANSEN SINGER, ESQ.)

25 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an **ORDER**  
26 **ADMITTING TO PRACTICE (DAVID RANSEN SINGER, ESQ.)** was entered in the

27 ///

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 above entitled matter on September 25, 2019, a copy of which is attached hereto.

2 DATED this 26th day of September, 2019.

3 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

4  
5 /s/ Michael Gayan

6 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
7 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
8 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
9 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

11 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
12 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
13 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
14 JENNER & BLOCK  
15 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
16 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

17 *Attorneys for Defendants*

18 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

19 I hereby certify that on the 26th day of September, 2019, I served a true and correct copy  
20 of the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE**  
21 **(DAVID RANSEN SINGER, ESQ.)** via the Court's electronic filing system only, pursuant to  
22 the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties  
23 currently on the electronic service list.

24  
25 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

26 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP  
27  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway


Seventeenth Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
9/25/2019 3:00 PM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
JENNER & BLOCK, LLP  
9 633 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
10 Telephone: (213) 239-2206  
*Attorneys for Defendants*

11 **DISTRICT COURT**

12 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
14 corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
18 a Delaware limited liability company; and  
19 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
20 a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.  
22

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI


23 **ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE**  
24 **(DAVID RANSEN SINGER, ESQ.)**

25 **DAVID RANSEN SINGER, ESQ.**, having filed his Motion to Associate Counsel under  
26 Nevada Supreme Court Rule 42, together with a Verified Application for Association of  
27 Counsel, a Certificate of Good Standing for the State of California, and the State Bar of Nevada  
28 Statement; said application having been noticed, no objections having been made, and the Court  
being fully apprised in the premises, and good cause appearing, it is hereby

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kemplaw.com


1           **ORDERED**, that said application is hereby granted, and **DAVID RANSEN SINGER**,  
2 **ESQ.**, is hereby admitted to practice in the above entitled Court for the purposed of the above  
3 entitled matter only.

4           DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2019.

5  
6   
7 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE  
8

9 Respectfully submitted,

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11   
12 J. Randal Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
13 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
14 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
15 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

17 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
18 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
19 David R. Singer, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
20 JENNER & BLOCK, LLP  
21 633 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
22 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
23 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway


Seventeenth Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
9/26/2019 10:54 AM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
Mona Kavch, (#11825)  
m.kavch@kempjones.com  
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendants.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER  
ADMITTING TO PRACTICE (AMY  
MARSHALL GALLEGOS, ESQ.)**

YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an **ORDER  
ADMITTING TO PRACTICE (AMY MARSHALL GALLEGOS, ESQ.)** was entered in the

///

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 above entitled matter on September 25, 2019, a copy of which is attached hereto.

2 DATED this 26th day of September, 2019.

3 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

4  
5 /s/ Michael Gayan

6 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
7 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
8 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
9 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

11 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
12 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
13 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
14 JENNER & BLOCK  
15 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
16 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

17 *Attorneys for Defendants*

18 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

19 I hereby certify that on the 26th day of September, 2019, I served a true and correct copy  
20 of the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE (AMY  
21 MARSHALL GALLEGOS, ESQ.)** via the Court's electronic filing system only, pursuant to  
22 the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties  
23 currently on the electronic service list.

24  
25 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

26 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP  
27  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway

Seventeenth Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001

kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
JENNER & BLOCK, LLP  
9 633 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
10 Telephone: (213) 239-2206  
Attorneys for Defendants

11 **DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
14 corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.


17 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
18 a Delaware limited liability company; and  
19 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
20 a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.  
22

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

23 **ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE**  
24 **(AMY MARSHALL GALLEGOS, ESQ.)**

25 **AMY MARSHALL GALLEGOS, ESQ.**, having filed his Motion to Associate  
26 Counsel under Nevada Supreme Court Rule 42, together with a Verified Application for  
27 Association of Counsel, a Certificate of Good Standing for the State of California, and the State  
28 Bar of Nevada Statement; said application having been noticed, no objections having been  
made, and the Court being fully apprised in the premises, and good cause appearing, it is hereby



**ORDERED**, that said application is hereby granted, and **AMY MARSHALL GALLEGOS, ESQ.**, is hereby admitted to practice in the above entitled Court for the purposed of the above entitled matter only.

DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2019.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Respectfully submitted,

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
David R. Singer, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)  
JENNER & BLOCK, LLP  
633 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
*Attorneys for Defendants*

**KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP**  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kcmjones.com

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY****CASE NO. A-18-772591-B****Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)****vs.****News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)**§  
§  
§  
§  
§Location: **Department 16**Judicial Officer: **Williams, Timothy C.**Filed on: **04/10/2018**

Case Number History:

Cross-Reference Case **A772591**

Number:




**CASE INFORMATION**Case Type: **Other Business Court Matters**Case  
Status: **04/10/2018 Open****DATE****CASE ASSIGNMENT****Current Case Assignment**

Case Number	A-18-772591-B
Court	Department 16
Date Assigned	08/27/2018
Judicial Officer	Williams, Timothy C.

**PARTY INFORMATION**

<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Las Vegas Sun Inc</b>	<i>Lead Attorneys</i> <b>Reid, Leif</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-823-2900(W)
<b>Defendant</b>	<b>Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc</b>	<b>Jones, Jon Randall</b> <i>Retained</i> 7023856000(W)
	<b>News+Media Capital Group LLC</b>	<b>Jones, Jon Randall</b> <i>Retained</i> 7023856000(W)
<b>Counter Claimant</b>	<b>Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc</b>	<b>Jones, Jon Randall</b> <i>Retained</i> 7023856000(W)
<b>Counter Defendant</b>	<b>Las Vegas Sun Inc</b>	<b>Reid, Leif</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-823-2900(W)

**DATE****EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT****INDEX****EVENTS**

04/10/2018	 Complaint (Business Court) Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Complaint</i>
04/10/2018	 Initial Appearance Fee Disclosure Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Initial Appearance Fee Disclosure</i>
04/10/2018	 Summons Electronically Issued - Service Pending Party: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Summons</i>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**  
**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

04/10/2018	 Summons Electronically Issued - Service Pending Party: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Summons</i>
04/12/2018	 Notice Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Related Cases</i>
04/19/2018	 Affidavit of Service Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Affidavit of Service News+Media Capital Group LLC c/o CSC Service of Nevada Inc.-Registered Agent</i>
04/19/2018	 Affidavit of Service Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Affidavit of Service LV Review Journal, Inc. c/o CSC Service of Nevada Inc.-Registered Agent</i>
04/27/2018	 Motion to Compel Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Arbitration</i>
05/07/2018	 Motion to Dismiss Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC <i>Defendants' Motion to Dismiss</i>
05/07/2018	 Initial Appearance Fee Disclosure Filed By: Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Initial Appearance Fee Disclosure (NRS Chapter 19)</i>
05/16/2018	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Stipulation and Order to Vacate, Continue, and Consolidate Hearings on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss</i>
05/17/2018	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Vacate, Continue, and Consolidate Hearings on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Defendants Motion to Dismiss</i>
07/18/2018	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Stipulation and Order to Vacate and Continue Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and to Extend Deadlines for Filing Motion Responses</i>
07/19/2018	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Vacate and Continue Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and to Extend Deadlines for Filing Motion Responses</i>
08/22/2018	 Stipulation and Order

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Stipulation and Order to Vacate and Continue Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and to Extend Deadlines for Filing Motion Responses*

08/22/2018



Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Vacate and Continue Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and to Extend Deadlines for Filing Motion Responses*

08/22/2018



Notice of Department Reassignment

*Notice of Department Reassignment*

08/24/2018



Peremptory Challenge

Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendants' Peremptory Challenge of Judge*

08/27/2018



Notice of Department Reassignment

*Notice of Department Reassignment*

09/17/2018



Opposition to Motion to Dismiss

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss*

09/17/2018



Response

Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration*

09/17/2018



Stipulation and Order

Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Stipulation and Order to Extend Deadlines for Filing Motion Responses on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss*

10/02/2018



Stipulation and Order

Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Stipulation and Order to Vacate and Continue Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and to Extend Deadlines for Filing Motion Replies*

10/03/2018



Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order*

10/17/2018



Reply

Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants' Response to Motion to Compel Arbitration*

10/17/2018









Reply

Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendants' Reply in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss*

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

11/07/2018	 Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract/Specific Performance (First and Fourth Claims for Relief)</i>
11/21/2018	 Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss</i>
11/21/2018	 Motion to Extend Party: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Motion to Extend Deadline for the Filing of Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and to Vacate and Reschedule Hearing on Order Shortening Time (First Request)</i>
11/27/2018	 Notice of Entry Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss</i>
11/27/2018	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Extend Deadline for the Filing of Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and to Vacate and Reschedule the Hearing on Order Shortening Time</i>
12/03/2018	 Motion to Reconsider Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration of Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, and Request for Stay on Order Shortening Time</i>
12/10/2018	 Affidavit in Support Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Affidavit of Richard J. Pocker in Support of Request to Postpone Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment Until Close of Discovery Pursuant to Rule 56(f) of the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure</i>
12/10/2018	 Response Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract/Specific Performance (First and Fourth (sic) Claims for Relief)</i>
12/11/2018	 Request for Judicial Notice Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants' Request for Judicial Notice in Support of Their Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract/Specific Performance (First and Fourth (sic) Claims for Relief)</i>
12/11/2018	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc



EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**



*Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration of Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, and Request for Stay on Order Shortening Time*

12/14/2018	 Answer Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Answer to Complaint</i>
12/17/2018	 Reply Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Reply to Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract/Specific Performance</i>
12/17/2018	 Reply in Support Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants' Reply In Support of Motion for Reconsideration of Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, and Request for Stay on Order Shortening Time</i>
12/18/2018	 Notice of Appearance Party: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Appearance</i>
01/14/2019	 Order Denying Motion Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Order Denying Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration of Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Request for Stay on Order Shortening Time</i>
01/15/2019	 Notice of Entry Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Order Denying Defendants Motion for Reconsideration of Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration And Denying Defendants Motion to Dismiss And Request for Stay on Order Shortening Time</i>
01/30/2019	 Notice of Appearance Party: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice of Appearance</i>
02/13/2019	 Joint Case Conference Report Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Joint Case Conference Report</i>
03/18/2019	 Business Court Order <i>Business Court Order</i>
04/03/2019	 Demand for Jury Trial Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Demand for Jury Trial</i>
04/08/2019	 Order Setting Civil Jury Trial and Calendar Call <i>Order Setting Civil Jury Trial and Calendar Call</i>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

06/05/2019	 Stipulation to Extend Discovery Party: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Stipulation and Order to Continue Discovery, Case Deadlines, and Trial Date</i>
06/05/2019	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Continue Discovery, Case Deadlines, and Trial Date</i>
06/06/2019	 Amended Order Setting Jury Trial <i>Amended Order Setting Jury Trial</i>
07/17/2019	 Motion for Protective Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Motion for Protective Order and Objections Under NRCP 45</i>
07/18/2019	 Clerk's Notice of Hearing <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
07/29/2019	 Opposition to Motion For Protective Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion for Protective Order and Objections Under NRCP 45</i>
08/08/2019	 Stipulated Protective Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Stipulated Confidentiality and Protective Order</i>
08/09/2019	 Notice of Appearance Party: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Appearance</i>
08/09/2019	 Notice of Entry Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Stipulated Confidentiality and Protective Order</i>
08/13/2019	 Stipulation Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Stipulated Discovery Exchange Protocol and Order</i>
08/14/2019	 Notice of Entry Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Stipulated Discovery Exchange Protocol and Order</i>
08/14/2019	 Reply in Support Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Review-Journal's Reply in Support of Motion for Protective Order and Objections Re Huffman Subpoena</i>
08/14/2019	 Declaration Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Declaration of Keith Moyer</i>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

08/15/2019	 Substitution of Attorney Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Substitution Of Attorneys</i>
08/19/2019	 Supplement to Opposition Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Supplemental Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Protective Order and Objections Under NRCP 45</i>
08/19/2019	 Motion to Compel Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents</i>
08/20/2019	 Clerk's Notice of Hearing <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
08/20/2019	 Objection Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants' Objection To Plaintiff's Improper Supplement Related To Defendants' Motion For Protective Order And Objections Under NRCP 45</i>
08/30/2019	 Motion to Amend Answer Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC <i>Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim on Order Shortening Time</i>
09/09/2019	 Notice of Appearance Party: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Appearance</i>
09/09/2019	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Opposition to Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim on Order Shortening Time (Redacted)</i>
09/09/2019	 Motion to Seal/Redact Records Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal</i>
09/10/2019	 Filed Under Seal Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Filed Under Seal per 9/9/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal. Opposition to Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim on Order Shortening Time</i>
09/10/2019	 Clerk's Notice of Hearing <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
09/12/2019	 Motion to Associate Counsel Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*Motion To Associate Counsel (Richard Lee Stone, Esq.)*

09/12/2019



Motion to Associate Counsel

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc

*Motion To Associate Counsel (Amy Marshall Gallegos, Esq.)*

09/12/2019



Motion to Associate Counsel

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc

*Motion To Associate Counsel (David Ransen Singer, Esq.)*

09/12/2019



Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Notice of Hearing*

09/12/2019



Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Notice of Hearing*

09/12/2019



Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Notice of Hearing*

09/12/2019



Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Amended Notice of Hearing*

09/13/2019



Motion to Seal/Redact Records

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal*

09/13/2019



Appendix

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Volume 1)*

09/13/2019



Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Notice of Hearing*

09/13/2019



Order Denying Motion

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc

*Order Denying Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion For Partial Summary Judgment*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc

*Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part Sealed per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal*

09/13/2019



Notice of Entry of Order

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc

*Notice Of Entry Of Order Denying Las Vegas Sun Inc.'s Motion For Partial Summary Judgment*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 13 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 14 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Volume 7) Sealed per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 15 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Volume 8) Sealed per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 16 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 17 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Volume 2) Sealed per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 9 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 10 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

 Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 11 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019

 Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Volume 3) Sealed per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents under Seal*

09/13/2019

 Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiffs Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate, or Alternatively Modify or Correct the Award in Part - Volume 12 (Filed under Seal per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal)*

09/13/2019

 Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Volume 4) Sealed per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents under Seal*

09/13/2019

 Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Volume 6) Sealed per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents under Seal*

09/13/2019

 Filed Under Seal


Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Appendix of Exhibits to: Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (Volume 5) Sealed per 9/13/19 Motion for Leave to File Documents under Seal*

09/18/2019

 Motion for Leave to File


Party: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendants' Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal*

09/18/2019

 Motion to Vacate


Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendants' Motion To Vacate Arbitration Award*

09/18/2019

 Reply in Support

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Reply In Support Of Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion For Leave To Amend Answer And Assert Counterclaim On Order Shortening Time*

09/19/2019

 Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Notice of Hearing*

09/19/2019

 Clerk's Notice of Hearing

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**  
**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*Notice of Hearing*

09/19/2019	 Filed Under Seal Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award 9/18/19 Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal</i>
09/24/2019	 Notice Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Related Federal Court Action</i>
09/24/2019	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Stipulation And Order To Continue Hearing On Plaintiff's Motion To Confirm Arbitration Award, In Part, And To Vacate Or, Alternatively, Modify Of Correct The Award, In Part And To Set Briefing Schedules</i>
09/24/2019	 Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Stipulation And Order To Extend Discovery Deadlines</i>
09/24/2019	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Stipulation And Order To Continue Hearing On Plaintiff's Motion To Compel And To Set Briefing Schedule</i>
09/24/2019	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order To Continue Hearing On Plaintiff's Motion To Compel And To Set Briefing Schedule</i>
09/24/2019	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order To Extend Discovery Deadlines</i>
09/24/2019	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order To Continue Hearing On Plaintiff's Motion To Confirm Arbitration Award, In Part, And To Vacate Or, Alternatively, Modify Or Correct The Award, In Part And To Set Briefing Schedules</i>
09/25/2019	 Order Admitting to Practice Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Order Admitting To Practice (David Ransen Singer, Esq.)</i>
09/25/2019	 Order Admitting to Practice Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Order Admitting To Practice (Amy Marshall Gallegos, Esq.)</i>



EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

09/25/2019	 Order Admitting to Practice Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Order Admitting To Practice (Richard Lee Stone, Esq.)</i>
09/26/2019	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Order Admitting To Practice (Richard Lee Stone, Esq.)</i>
09/26/2019	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Order Admitting To Practice (Amy Marshall Gallegos, Esq.)</i>
09/26/2019	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Order Admitting To Practice (David Ransen Singer, Esq.)</i>
09/27/2019	 Non Opposition Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Non-Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal</i>
09/27/2019	 Notice of Intent Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Intent To File Opposition To Plaintiff's Motions For Leave To File Documents Under Seal</i>
09/30/2019	 Amended Answer <i>First Amended Answer To Complaint And Counterclaims</i>
09/30/2019	 Motion to Seal/Redact Records Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants' Motion To Seal Opposition And Exhibits A-K</i>
09/30/2019	 Motion for Leave to File Party: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint</i>
09/30/2019	 Filed Under Seal Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in part, and to Vacate or Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in part, and Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part</i>
09/30/2019	 Clerk's Notice of Hearing <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
09/30/2019	 Opposition to Motion



EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendants' Limited Opposition To Motions For Leave To File Documents Under Seal*

09/30/2019



Opposition to Motion

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (Redacted)*

09/30/2019



Motion to Seal/Redact Records

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [The Sun's Opposition and Exhibits to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award]*

09/30/2019



Opposition to Motion

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Plaintiff's Limited Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits B and C to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award, and References Thereto in Motion to Vacate]*

10/01/2019



Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Notice of Hearing*

10/01/2019



Filed Under Seal

*Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award*

10/02/2019



Opposition to Motion to Compel

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC  
*Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents*

10/03/2019



Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Notice of Hearing*

10/08/2019



Order

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Order Granting In Part Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion For Protective Order And Objections Under NRCP 45*

10/08/2019



Notice of Entry of Order

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Notice Of Entry Of Order*

10/10/2019



Opposition to Motion

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Plaintiff's Limited Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits A, B, D, and G-K to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award in Part, and References Thereto]*

10/10/2019



Opposition to Motion

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC  
*Defendants' Limited Opposition to Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [The Sun's Opposition and Exhibits to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award]*

10/10/2019

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**



Opposition to Motion

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC  
*Defendants' (1) Limited Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint and (2) Countermotion to Continue Trial*

10/11/2019



Reply in Support

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC  
*Reply in Support of Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal*

10/11/2019



Motion to Seal/Redact Records

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendants' Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal*

10/11/2019



Reply in Support

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendants' Reply In Support Of Motion To Vacate Arbitration Award*

10/11/2019



Reply to Opposition

Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc.'s Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Defendants' Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (Redacted)*

10/11/2019



Motion to Seal/Redact Records

Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 3-6 to Reply to Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part, and References Thereto]*

10/11/2019



Reply to Opposition

Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Reply to Defendants' Limited Opposition to Motions for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim and Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, In Part]*

10/11/2019



Reply

Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc  
*Reply to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents*

10/14/2019



Clerk's Notice of Hearing

*Notice of Hearing*

10/14/2019



Filed Under Seal

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc  
*Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (FUS from Motion dated 10/11/19)*

10/14/2019



Reply in Support

Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*Reply In Support Of Defendants Nesw+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion To Confirm Arbitration Award, In Part, And To Vacate The Award, In Part*

10/14/2019	 Filed Under Seal Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants' News &amp; Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc.'s Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part and Defendant's Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part</i>
10/14/2019	 Motion to Dismiss Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or, Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i>
10/15/2019	 Clerk's Notice of Hearing <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
10/15/2019	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Stipulation And Order To Continue Hearing On All Motions Set For Hearing On October 16, 2019</i>
10/15/2019	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order To Continue Hearing On All Motions Set For Hearing On October 16, 2019</i>
10/21/2019	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Limited Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits E-H to Defendants' Reply in Support of Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award, and References Thereto in Motion to Vacate]</i>
10/21/2019	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC <i>Defendants' Limited Opposition to Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 3-6 to Reply to Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part, and References Thereto]</i>
10/23/2019	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Stipulation And Order To Extend Time For Defendants To File A Response In Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Dismiss</i>
10/23/2019	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order To Extend Time For Defendants To File A Response In Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Dismiss</i>
10/25/2019	 Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*Order Granting Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim on Order Shortening Time*

10/28/2019	 Notice of Entry Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim on Order Shortening Time</i>
10/28/2019	 Opposition to Motion to Dismiss Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Counterclaimant Las Vegas Review-Journal's Opposition To Counter-Defendant Las Vegas Sun's Motion To Dismiss Counterclaims</i>
11/01/2019	 Reply Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's (1) Reply to Limited Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint and (2) Opposition to Countermotion to Continue Trial</i>
11/01/2019	 Reply to Opposition Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Reply to Defendants' Limited Opposition to Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [The Sun's Opposition and Exhibits to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award]</i>
11/01/2019	 Reply in Support Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC <i>Reply in Support of Defendants' Motion to Seal Opposition and Exhibits A-K</i>
11/04/2019	 Reply in Support Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Reply In Support Of Defendants' Countermotion To Continue Trial</i>
11/05/2019	 Status Report Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Plaintiff's Status Report for Status Check Regarding Outstanding Discovery Issues</i>
11/08/2019	 Reply to Opposition Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Reply to Defendants' Limited Opposition to Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 3-6 to Reply to Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and References Thereto]</i>
11/08/2019	 Reply in Support Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Reply In Support Of Defendants' Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal (Exhibits E-H To Defendants' Reply In Support Of Motion To Vacate Arbitration Award And References Thereto)</i>
11/12/2019	 Objection Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s (1) Objection To Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Binder Of Exhibits Submitted To The Court On November 6, 2019, And (2) Request For Court To Defer Ruling On Arbitration Motions</i>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

11/12/2019	 Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint and Granting in Part Defendants' Countermotion to Continue Trial</i>
11/14/2019	 Notice of Entry Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint and Granting in Part Defendants' Countermotion to Continue Trial</i>
11/15/2019	 First Amended Complaint Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>First Amended Complaint</i>
11/18/2019	 Reply in Support Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Reply In Support Of Motion To Dismiss Counterclaims Or, Alternatively, To Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i>
11/18/2019	 Appendix Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Appendix To Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Reply In Support Of Motion To Dismiss Counterclaims Or, Alternatively, To Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i>
11/18/2019	 Motion to Seal/Redact Records Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 7 And 9 To Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Reply In Support Of Motion To Dismiss Counterclaims Or, Alternatively, To Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action And References Thereto]</i>
11/18/2019	 Motion for Protective Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Motion for Protective Order Staying Discovery Pending Resolution of Sun's Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims, or Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i>
11/19/2019	 Clerk's Notice of Hearing <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
11/19/2019	 Clerk's Notice of Hearing <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
11/19/2019	 Motion Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion To Modify Protective Order On Order Shortening Time</i>
11/19/2019	 Notice of Change of Hearing <i>Notice of Change of Hearing</i>
11/19/2019	 Filed Under Seal Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

11/19/2019	 Filed Under Seal Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Appendix to Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i>
11/20/2019	 Amended Order Setting Jury Trial <i>2nd Amended Order Setting Civil Jury Trial, Pre-Trial, Calendar Call, and Deadlines for Motions; Amended Discovery Scheduling Order</i>
11/21/2019	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Stipulation and Order to Extend Deadline for Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or, Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action (First Request)</i>
11/21/2019	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Extend Deadline for Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or, Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action (First Request)</i>
11/22/2019	 Motion to Stay Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Emergency Motion To Stay Case And Postpone Action On Arbitration-Related Motions On Order Shortening Time</i>
11/25/2019	 Stipulation and Order Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Stipulation And Order To Extend Time For Defendants To File Response To Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint</i>
11/25/2019	 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order To Extend Time For Defendants To File Response To Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint</i>
11/27/2019	 Notice of Rescheduling of Hearing Filed by: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Rescheduling</i>
12/02/2019	 Non Opposition Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Defendants' Non-Opposition To Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal (Exhibits 7 And 9 To Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Motion To Dismiss Counterclaims Or, Alternatively, To Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action And References Thereto)</i>
12/02/2019	 Motion to Seal/Redact Records Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 5, 7, and 9 to Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Opposition to Defendants' Emergency Motion to Stay Case and Postpone Action on Arbitration-Related Motions on OST and References Thereto]</i>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**  
**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

12/02/2019	 Opposition and Countermotion <i>Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Opposition to News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Emergency Motion to Stay Case and Postpone Action on Arbitration-Related Motions on Order Shortening Time and Countermotion to Stay Defendants' Tenth, Twenty-Sixth and Twenty-Seventh Affirmative Defenses (Redacted)</i>
12/02/2019	 Opposition and Countermotion Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>News+Media Capital Group LLC's And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s (1) Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For Protective Order Staying Discovery Pending Resolution Of Sun's Motion To Dismiss Counterclaims, Or Alternatively, To Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action, And In The Alternative, (2) Countermotion To Stay All Discovery</i>
12/02/2019	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Opposition to News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Modify Protective Order on Order Shortening Time</i>
12/03/2019	 Reply in Support Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Reply In Support Of News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Emergency Motion to Stay Case and Postpone Action on Arbitration-Related Motions on Order Shortening Time and Opposition to Countermotion to Stay Defendants' Tenth, Twenty-Sixth And Twenty-Seventh Affirmative Defenses</i>
12/03/2019	 Filed Under Seal Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Las Vegas Sun Inc's Opposition to News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc's Emergency Motion to Stay Case and Postpone Action on Arbitration-Related Motions on Order Shortening Time and Countermotion to Stay Defendants' Tenth, Twenty-Sixth and Twenty-Seventh Affirmative Defenses 12/02/19 Motion to Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 5,7, and 9 to Las Vegas Inc's Opposition to Defendants' Emergency Motion to Stay Case and Postpone Action on Arbitration-Related Motions on OST and References Thereto</i>
12/03/2019	 Clerk's Notice of Hearing <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
12/17/2019	 Order Granting <i>Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents</i>
12/18/2019	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Order Granting In Part And Denying In Part Plaintiff's Motion To Compel Production Of Documents</i>
01/03/2020	 Objection Filed By: Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Objection to Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Affirming the Arbitration Award</i>
01/09/2020	 Order Granting Motion




EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**  
**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

	Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Pltff's Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or Alternatively to Stay</i>
01/13/2020	 Notice of Entry of Order Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i>
01/16/2020	 Motion for Leave to File <i>News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion For Leave To File Additional Briefing Requested By Court On Order Shortening Time</i>
01/21/2020	 Notice of Withdrawal of Attorney Filed by: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice of Withdrawal of Attorney Akke Levin</i>
01/28/2020	 Opposition to Motion Filed By: Counter Defendant Las Vegas Sun Inc <i>Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Opposition to News+Media Capital Groups LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to File Additional Briefing Requested by Court on Order Shortening Time</i>
01/28/2020	 Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Findings Of Facts, Conclusions Of Law, And Order Affirming The Arbitration Award</i>
01/28/2020	 Notice of Entry Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>Notice Of Entry Of Findings Of Facts, Conclusions Of Law And Order Affirming The Arbitration Award</i>
01/28/2020	 Notice of Appeal Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Notice Of Appeal</i>
01/28/2020	 Case Appeal Statement Filed By: Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC; Counter Claimant Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc <i>News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Case Appeal Statement</i>

**HEARINGS**

08/22/2018	 <b>Minute Order (2:27 PM)</b> (Judicial Officer: Denton, Mark R.) <i>Minute Order: Recusal</i> Minute Order - No Hearing Held; Minute Order: Recusal Journal Entry Details:  <i>GIVEN the Court s previous professional relationship with one of the parties and its previous professional and long-time personal friendship with principals of the same, and to avoid the appearance of impropriety, the Court RECUSES from further involvement in this case and directs that it be reassigned to another Business Court Department. CANON 2, Rule 2.11, Commentary [1]. IT IS SO ORDERED. CLERK S NOTE: This Minute Order was electronically served by Courtroom Clerk, April Watkins, to all registered parties for Odyssey</i>
------------	---






EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*File & serve. aw;*

10/24/2018	<p><b>Motion to Compel</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  <i>Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Arbitration</i>                      Minute Order Dated 08-22-18                      Motion Granted;</p>
10/24/2018	<p><b>Motion to Dismiss</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  <i>Defendants' Motion to Dismiss</i>                      Minute Order Dated 08-22-18                      Motion Denied;</p>
10/24/2018	<p> <b>All Pending Motions</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><b>MINUTES</b>                      Matter Heard;                      Journal Entry Details:  <i>APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Robert Cauthorn, representative of Las Vegas Sun, present. DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS...PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION Arguments by counsel on Motions. Court stated ITS FINDINGS and ORDERED, Motion to Dismiss DENIED; Motion to Compel GRANTED. Pltf. to prepare order and circulate to counsel.;</i></p>
12/04/2018	<p> <b>Motion</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  <i>Motion to Extend Deadline for the Filing of Defendants Response to Plaintiffs Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and to Vacate and Reschedule Hearing on Order Shortening Time (First Request)</i>                      Motion Granted;                      Journal Entry Details:  <i>APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Robert Cauthorn, representative of Las Vegas Sun, present. Matter of Motion to Extend Deadline for the Filing of Defendants Response to Plaintiffs Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and to Vacate and Reschedule Hearing on Order Shortening Time (First Request). Arguments by counsel. Colloquy regarding possible continuance of all pending matters and scheduling briefing. COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED; Response to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment DUE 12/10/18; Reply thereto DUE 12/17/18 by 12:00 p.m. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, following matters CONTINUED: Pltf's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Defts' Motion for Reconsideration on Order Shortening Time. CONTINUED TO: 12/19/18 1:15 P.M.;</i></p>
12/19/2018	<p><b>Motion for Partial Summary Judgment</b> (1:15 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  <i>Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract/Specific Performance (First and Fourth Claims for Relief)</i>                      Motion Denied; See 2/4/19 Minute Order</p>
12/19/2018	<p><b>Motion For Reconsideration</b> (1:15 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  <i>Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration of Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Arbitration and Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, and Request for Stay on Order Shortening Time</i>                      Motion Denied;</p>
12/19/2018	<p> <b>All Pending Motions</b> (1:15 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)                      Matter Heard;                      Journal Entry Details:  <i>APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Nicole Scott, Esq. present for Pltf. Las Vegas Sun. Representatives of Las Vegas Sun present: Brian Greenspun, Myra Greenspun, and Robert Cauthorn, present. DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF COURT'S ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION AND DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, AND REQUEST FOR STAY ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME Arguments by counsel. COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED; Ms. Martini to prepare detailed amended order within a week. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND BREACH OF</i></p>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*CONTRACT/SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE Arguments by counsel. Court advised decision forthcoming within a week.;*

02/04/2019



**Minute Order** (8:13 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

*re: Plaintiff LVS s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract for Specific Performance (First and Fourth Claims for Relief)*

Minute Order - No Hearing Held;

Journal Entry Details:

*After a review and consideration of the points and authorities on file herein, and the argument of counsel, the Court determined as follows: The Court has reviewed the issues raised by Plaintiff, Las Vegas, Sun, Inc. (LVS) in its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract/Specific Performance (First and Fourth Claims for Relief). It is clear that the Joint Operating Agreement (JOA) is binding and controls the contractual relationship as to LVS and the News+Media Capital Group, LLC. (News-Media). However, issues as to whether there is a material breach of Section 5.1 and Appendices A and B of the JOA by Defendant, News-Media are questions of fact and not the proper basis to support granting summary judgment at this time. Additionally, the remedy of specific performance is only available as an alternative claim to monetary damage where the remedy at law is inadequate. It is premature at this time to reach such a conclusion. Ultimately, the Court anticipates that all issues of compliance and/or breach of Section 5.1 and Appendices A and B of the JOA will require expert testimony to assist the trier of fact in reaching their decision in this matter. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff LVS s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract for Specific Performance (First and Fourth Claims for Relief) shall be DENIED. Counsel for News-Media shall prepare a detailed Order, Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law, based not only on the foregoing Minute Order, but also on the record on file herein. This is to be submitted to adverse counsel for review and approval and/or submission of a competing Order or objections, prior to submitting to the Court for review and signature. CLERK S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.;*

04/03/2019



**Mandatory Rule 16 Conference** (9:15 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

Matter Heard;

Journal Entry Details:

*Matter of Mandatory Discovery Conference. Ms. Martini advised related arbitration begins 4/15/19 and concludes 4/26/19. Colloquy regarding impact of the arbitration as to discovery proceeding in this case and claims anticipated for trial. Court stated 2 weeks to be set aside for trial. As to witnesses, Ms. Martini advised 13 total which accounts for 3 duplicates. Ms. Levin advised a confidentiality and protective order and ESI to be negotiated. There being agreement, COURT ORDERED, Trial dates SET; Close of Discovery SET 9/27/19. Department to issue scheduling order. 1/9/20 10:30 AM PRETRIAL/CALENDAR CALL 1/27/20 9:30 AM BENCH TRIAL ;*

08/21/2019



**Motion for Protective Order** (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

*Motion for Protective Order and Objections Under NRCP 45*

Granted in Part; See 9/4/19 Minute Order

Journal Entry Details:

*APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Benjamin Lipman, Esq. also present as General Counsel for Las Vegas Review-Journal. Matter of Review-Journal's Motion for Protective Order and Objections Under NRCP 45. Mr. Jones argued for opportunity for review and privilege log, and for expansive view as to a representative. Ms. Martini proposed monthly case management conferences and argued burden not met as to whether fact witness at issue covered. Court stated decision to issue next week by way of Minute Order. Colloquy regarding proposed monthly conferences. Court stated if efforts to resolve issue discussed are unsuccessful, Court will entertain motion on order shortening time from Ms. Martini.;*

09/04/2019



**Minute Order** (12:12 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

*Motion for Protective Order and Objections Under NRCP 45*

Minute Order - No Hearing Held;

Journal Entry Details:

*After review and consideration of the arguments of counsel and the moving papers on file herein, the Court determined as follows: Upon reflection, the Court has considered Defendant News+Media Capital Group, LLC and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc. s (Collectively the*

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*R.J.s ) Motion for a Protective Order as it relates to Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. s (LV Sun) Notice of Subpoena Duces Tecum regarding the files of J. Ford Huffman. According to the declaration of Keith Moyer dated August 14, 2019, Mr. Huffman was retained to perform two functions. The first task was to assist R.J. employees and managers in the redesign of the newspaper, including the LV Sun insert portion of the newspaper. Mr. Huffman also consulted with and assisted the R.J. as a litigation consultant in responding to the LV Sun s Motion for Summary Judgment. The Court is well aware of positions asserted by the parties and would probably be required to conduct an evidentiary hearing to determine if Mr. Huffman s role in assisting the R.J. rose to the level of functional equivalent of an employee and thus subject to attorney client privilege. Additionally, Defendant R.J. alleges that Mr. Huffman was retained as a litigation consultant resulting in the application of the work product doctrine. Considering the totality of the arguments presented, without a more developed record, it is uncertain as to whether the functional equivalent doctrine applies at this time. However, it is patently apparent that Mr. Huffman has been retained by Defendant R.J. in the dual capacity to work on the newspaper redesign and as a litigation consultant. As a result of Mr. Huffman s dual capacity, the Court will take a cautious approach to the production of documents in Mr. Huffman s possession. In order to prevent the inadvertent disclosure of privileged documents, the Court feels that in order to save time and expedite discovery in this matter and without the necessity of an evidentiary hearing, the Court shall require Mr. Huffman to supply all documents in his possession to Defendant R.J., who then shall be required to prepare a privilege log identifying all documents with particularity and assert the basis, if any for privileged documents for the record. The privileged log shall be prepared and exchanged by counsel within ten days from entry of this Court s order. In addition, the Court shall set a status check on 10/16/2019 at 9:00AM to expedite the discovery and to address the applicability of any asserted privileges. Consequently, Defendant R.J. s Motion for Protective Order shall be Granted in Part as to potential work product privileged based on work as a litigation consultant and Denied in Part as to the functional equivalent employer classifications. Counsel for Defendant R.J. shall prepare a detailed Order, Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law, based not only on the foregoing Minute Order, but also on the record on file herein. This is to be submitted to adverse counsel for review and approval and/or submission of a competing Order or objections, prior to submitting to the Court for review and signature. CLERK'S NOTE: The above Minute Order has been corrected with regards to the status check date as was brought to the Court s attention. The initial 10/4/19 setting was a date on which the Court is unavailable; the correct status check date is 10/16/19 at 9:00 a.m. as reflected above. This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile. /cd 9-26-19/;*

09/25/2019



**Motion for Leave (9:00 AM)** (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

*Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim on Order Shortening Time*  
Motion Granted;  
Journal Entry Details:

*APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Representatives of Pltf. present: Brian Greenspun, Myra Greenspun, and Amy Greenspun. Benjamin Lipman, Esq. present as General Counsel for Deft. Las Vegas Review-Journal. Attorney David Singer, Pro Hac pending, present for Defts. Matter of Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim on Order Shortening Time. Mr. Jones requested pending Motions to Associate Counsel David Singer, Amy Gallegos, and Richard Stone be granted. Mr. Reid advised no opposition to the Motions. COURT ORDERED, Motions to Associate Counsel GRANTED. Arguments by Mr. Jones and Mr. Pisanelli regarding Motion for Leave. COURT ORDERED, Motion for Leave GRANTED; no rights have been waived. Mr. Jones advised will prepare the order and circulate to counsel.;*

10/16/2019

**CANCELED Status Check (9:00 AM)** (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

*Vacated - per Stipulation and Order*  
*Status Check re Trial Readiness*

10/16/2019

**CANCELED Motion to Associate Counsel (9:00 AM)** (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

*Vacated*  
*Defendant's Motion To Associate Counsel (Richard Lee Stone, Esq.)*



10/16/2019

**CANCELED Motion to Associate Counsel (9:00 AM)** (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

*Vacated*  
*Defendant's Motion To Associate Counsel (Amy Marshall Gallegos, Esq.)*

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**  
**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**


10/16/2019	<b>CANCELED Motion to Associate Counsel</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Vacated</i> <i>Motion To Associate Counsel (David Ransen Singer, Esq.)</i>
10/22/2019	<b>Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award</b> (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part</i> Granted in Part; See 12/4/19 Minute Order
10/22/2019	<b>Motion to Vacate</b> (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Defendants' Motion To Vacate Arbitration Award</i> Motion Denied; See 12/4/19 Minute Order
10/22/2019	 <b>All Pending Motions</b> (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) Matter Heard; Journal Entry Details: <i>APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Benjamin Lipman, Esq. present as General Counsel for Deft. Las Vegas Review-Journal. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART...DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO VACATE ARBITRATION AWARD Argument by Mr. Reid. CONFERENCE AT BENCH. Arguments by Mr. Reid and Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones provided document for Court's review. Colloquy regarding scheduling other pending matters from today. As to the Arbitration Motions, Court stated will issue decision after review of issues regarding exceeding powers, common law, sufficient evidence, and manifest disregard. COURT ORDERED, outstanding pending matters from today CONTINUED. CONTINUED TO: 10/31/19 1:00 PM PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD...DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO MOTION TO VACATE...PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND ANSWER AND ASSERT COUNTERCLAIM...PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS...STATUS CHECK: EXPEDITED DISCOVERY AND APPLICABILITY OF ASSERTED PRIVILEGES;</i>
10/31/2019	<b>Motion to Compel</b> (1:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents</i> Per 9/17/19 Stipulation and Order Motion Granted;
10/31/2019	<b>Motion to Seal/Redact Records</b> (1:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Plaintiff's Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal as to Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim</i> Under Advisement; See 11/12/19 Minutes
10/31/2019	<b>Motion for Leave</b> (1:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal as to Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award</i> Under Advisement; See 11/12/19 Minutes
10/31/2019	<b>Motion for Leave</b> (1:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Defendants' Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal</i> Under Advisement; See 11/12/19 Minutes
10/31/2019	<b>Status Check</b> (1:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Status Check: Expedited Discovery and Applicability of Asserted Privileges</i> Matter Heard;
10/31/2019	 <b>All Pending Motions</b> (1:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) Matter Heard;

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**  
**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

Journal Entry Details:

*PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS Arguments by Ms. Martini and Mr. Jones. COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED; documents must be provided; no sanctions at this time in light of third-party issues. Colloquy regarding a status check as to outstanding issues and electronically stored information ("ESI"). COURT FURTHER ORDERED, Status Check regarding same SET for time of 11/6/19 matters hearing. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD...PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND ANSWER AND ASSERT COUNTERCLAIM...DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL Arguments by Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones. Discussion regarding an appendix with tabs for submission of the Motions. Court directed the supplement delivered by Monday next week for a decision. STATUS CHECK: EXPEDITED DISCOVERY AND APPLICABILITY OF ASSERTED PRIVILEGES Court noted matter previously addressed. 11/4/19 3:00 AM (CHAMBERS) STATUS CHECK: SUPPLEMENT TO MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL 11/6/19 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY AND ESI;*

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| 11/06/2019 | <p><b>Motion to Seal/Redact Records</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)<br/> <i>Defendants Motion to Seal Opposition and Exhibits A-K</i><br/> Under Advisement; See 11/12/19 Minutes</p>   |
| 11/06/2019 | <p><b>Opposition and Countermotion</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)<br/> <b>11/06/2019, 11/12/2019</b><br/> <i>Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in part, and to Vacate or Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in part, and Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part</i><br/> Matter Continued;<br/> Granted in Part; See 12/4/19 Minute Order<br/> Matter Continued;<br/> Granted in Part; See 12/4/19 Minute Order</p> |
| 11/06/2019 | <p><b>Motion to Seal/Redact Records</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)<br/> <i>Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [The Sun's Opposition and Exhibits to Defendants' Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award]</i><br/> Under Advisement; See 11/12/19 Minutes</p>   |
| 11/06/2019 | <p><b>Motion for Leave</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)<br/> <i>Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint</i><br/> Motion Granted;</p>   |
| 11/06/2019 | <p><b>Opposition and Countermotion</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)<br/> <i>Defendants' (1) Limited Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint and (2) Countermotion to Continue Trial</i><br/> Decision Made;</p>  |
| 11/06/2019 | <p><b>Status Check</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)<br/> <b>11/06/2019, 11/12/2019</b><br/> <i>Status Check: Outstanding Discovery and ESI</i><br/> Matter Continued;<br/> Matter Heard;<br/> Matter Continued;<br/> Matter Heard;</p>   |
| 11/06/2019 | <p> <b>All Pending Motions</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)<br/> Matter Heard;<br/> Journal Entry Details:<br/> <i>APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Robert Cauthorn, COO of Las Vegas Sun, also present. DEFENDANTS MOTION TO SEAL OPPOSITION AND EXHIBITS A-K...MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL [THE SUN'S OPPOSITION AND EXHIBITS</i></p>   |




EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO VACATE ARBITRATION AWARD] Arguments by Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones. Court stated will review matters and issue detailed minute order shortly. Court further stated records at issue remain in their current state until time of the order. Colloquy regarding supplementation provided today by counsel as relates to forthcoming decision on sealing Motions. Court stated it sought documents Arbitrator was relying upon, namely, the joint operating agreements. Court also stated no preclusion from supplementing the matter further. Mr. Gayan advised will provide a supplement by tomorrow or Friday. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT...DEFENDANTS' (1) LIMITED OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT AND (2) COUNTERMOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL Arguments by Mr. Reid and Mr. Jones. COURT ORDERED, Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint GRANTED. Prevailing party to prepare the order. Discussion and argument by counsel regarding Countermotion to Continue Trial in light of two new claims. As to the Countermotion, COURT FURTHER ORDERED, case schedule as follows: Initial Experts 1/20/20; Rebuttal Experts 2/19/20; Close of Discovery 4/20/20; Dispositive Motions 5/18/20; Trial 6/15/20. Department to issue amended trial order. STATUS CHECK: OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY AND ESI...DEFENDANTS NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL, INC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND CONDITIONAL COUNTERMOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE THE AWARD, IN PART Colloquy regarding rescheduling remaining matters from today as well as 11/13/19 matters. COURT ORDERED, today's pending matters CONTINUED to 11/12/19 afternoon; 11/13/19 matters RESET to same 11/12/19 session. CONTINUED TO: 11/12/19 1:15 PM STATUS CHECK: OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY AND ESI...DEFENDANTS NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL, INC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND CONDITIONAL COUNTERMOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE THE AWARD, IN PART 11/12/19 1:15 PM DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL...MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL [EXHIBITS 3-6 TO REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND REFERENCES THERETO] 5/28/20 10:30 AM PRETRIAL/CALENDAR CALL 6/15/20 9:30 AM JURY TRIAL;



11/12/2019	<p><b>CANCELED Status Check</b> (3:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  <i>Vacated</i>  <i>Status Check: Supplement to Motions for Leave to File Documents Under Seal (Pending UA from 10/31 and 11/6 Hearings)</i></p>
11/12/2019	<p><b>Motion to Seal/Redact Records</b> (1:15 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  <i>Defendants' Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal</i>  Under Advisement;</p>
11/12/2019	<p><b>Motion to Seal/Redact Records</b> (1:15 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  <i>Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 3-6 to Reply to Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part, and References Thereto]</i>  Under Advisement;</p>
11/12/2019	<p> <b>All Pending Motions</b> (1:15 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  Matter Heard;  Journal Entry Details:  <b>MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL [EXHIBITS 3-6 TO REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND REFERENCES THERETO]...DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL</b> Matters submitted. Court stated will decide all seal issues together and notify counsel if assistance needed. DEFENDANTS NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL, INC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND CONDITIONAL COUNTERMOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE THE AWARD, IN PART Mr. Gayan presented binder of materials for Court's review. Court</p>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

noted receipt of materials needed for decision on the confirmation or vacate matter; decision anticipated before Thanksgiving Holiday. **STATUS CHECK: OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY AND ESI** Mr. Reid advised Ms. Martini unable to attend due to health issue. Mr. Gayan reviewed history of issues with vendor, the rational review, and custodians. Upon inquiry by Mr. Reid as to prior production compelled, Mr. Gayan advised will provide within two (2) weeks and earlier if possible. Court so noted. Discussion and arguments by counsel regarding custodians, search terms with respect to those involved in redesign, and second set of outstanding discovery. Mr. Jones presented documents for Court's review. Mr. Jones advised will perform search as discussed. Colloquy regarding special setting for results of ESI search and related issues as well as the Motion to Dismiss previously set 11/20. **COURT ORDERED, Motion to Dismiss REST from 11/20/19 9:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.; Status Check SET 11/20/19 at 10:00 a.m. as to the ESI search, custodian issues, and second set of outstanding discovery.** Mr. Reid advised will prepare order from today's hearing. 11/20/19 10:00 AM **STATUS CHECK: RESULTS OF ESI SEARCH/CUSTODIAN ISSUES/SECOND SET OF OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY CONTINUED TO: 11/20/19 10:00 AM MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTERCLAIMS OR, ALTERNATIVELY, TO STAY COUNTERCLAIMS PENDING FEDERAL COURT ACTION;**



- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| 11/20/2019 | <p><b>Motion to Dismiss</b> (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or, Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i></p> <p>Decision Made;</p>   |
| 11/20/2019 | <p><b>Status Check</b> (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><b>11/20/2019, 12/04/2019</b></p> <p><i>Status Check: Results of ESI Search/Custodian Issues/Second Set of Outstanding Discovery</i></p> <p>Matter Continued;</p> <p>Matter Heard;</p> <p>Matter Continued;</p> <p>Matter Heard;</p>  |
| 11/20/2019 | <p> <b>All Pending Motions</b> (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p>Matter Heard;</p> <p>Journal Entry Details:</p> <p><i>APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Benjamin Lipman, Esq. present as General Counsel for Deft. Las Vegas Review Journal. MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTERCLAIMS OR, ALTERNATIVELY, TO STAY COUNTERCLAIMS PENDING FEDERAL COURT ACTION...STATUS CHECK: RESULTS OF ESI SEARCH/CUSTODIAN ISSUES/SECOND SET OF OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY Arguments by Mr. Pisanelli and Mr. Jones regarding the Motion. COURT ORDERED, as to Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims, claims have merit until final adjudication; as to alternative Motion to Stay, matter stayed; will reserve ruling on subject matter jurisdiction and defer to pending resolution of action in Federal Court; Status Check SET in ninety (90) days regarding stay as to federal action. Colloquy regarding stay of entire case in light of anticipated issues with discovery. Court stated counsel may file appropriate motion for stay on order shortening time with setting not less than ten (10) days for response. Court directed Mr. Pisanelli prepare today's Motion order and circulate to counsel. As to today's Status Check, Mr. Reid advised the production outstanding of six months is promised next week. Court stated today's stay is not for purpose of the production. Mr. Gayan reviewed extensive search results, advised parties have agreed on certain terms and anticipates parties will meet and confer on issues. There being agreement, COURT ORDERED, Status Check matter CONTINUED to 12/4/19. CONTINUED TO: 12/4/19 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: RESULTS OF ESI SEARCH/CUSTODIAN ISSUES/SECOND SET OF OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY 2/19/20 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: STAY FOR FEDERAL ACTION;</i></p> |
| 11/27/2019 | <p> <b>Minute Order</b> (9:42 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Motions re: Arbitration Award</i></p> <p>Minute Order - No Hearing Held;</p> <p>Journal Entry Details:</p> <p><i>At the prior hearing in the instant matter, the Court restated its intention to publish a decision by a minute order on Defendants , New+MEDIA Capital Group LLC; Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc. (The RJ), Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and the Plaintiff s, Las Vegas Sun, Inc., Countermotion to Confirm the Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate the Award</i></p>   |

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*in Part before November 28, 2019. The Court has reviewed the parties submissions and has finalized its decision and minute order. However, in light of the recent filing by the RJ seeking to stay all aspects of this case, the Court believes out of fairness it cannot publish its decision until after a hearing on the merits of the RJ s Motion to Stay is held. CLERK'S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.;*

- 12/04/2019 **Motion to Stay** (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  
*News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Emergency Motion to Stay Case And Postpone Action on Arbitration-Related Motions on Order Shortening Time Granted in Part;*
- 12/04/2019 **Status Check** (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  
*Status Check: Decision on Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award; Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award  
Matter Heard;*
- 12/04/2019 **Opposition and Countermotion** (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  
*Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Opposition to News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Emergency Motion to Stay Case and Postpone Action on Arbitration-Related Motions on Order Shortening Time and Countermotion to Stay Defendants' Tenth, Twenty-Sixth and Twenty-Seventh Affirmative Defenses (Redacted)  
Decision Made;*
- 12/04/2019  **All Pending Motions** (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  
Matter Heard;  
Journal Entry Details:  
*APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Robert Cauthorn, COO for Pltf. Las Vegas Sun, present. Representatives of Pltf. present: Brian Greenspun and Myra Greenspun. Benjamin Lipman, Esq. present as General Counsel for Deft. Las Vegas Review-Journal. Representative of Deft. Las Vegas Review-Journal, Keith Moyer, present. EWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY CASE AND POSTPONE ACTION ON ARBITRATION-RELATED MOTIONS ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME...LAS VEGAS SUN, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY CASE AND POSTPONE ACTION ON ARBITRATION-RELATED MOTIONS ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME AND COUNTERMOTION TO STAY DEFENDANTS' TENTH, TWENTY-SIXTH AND TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES (REDACTED)...STATUS CHECK: DECISION ON MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD; MOTION TO VACATE ARBITRATION AWARD...STATUS CHECK: RESULTS OF ESI SEARCH/CUSTODIAN ISSUES/SECOND SET OF OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY Arguments by Mr. Jones and Mr. Pisanelli. COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART; DENIED as to issue with respect to decision on arbitration; will stay all other case matters. Prevailing party to submit the order. Court stated a minute order is anticipated today as to arbitration confirmation or vacation. Further stated will issue decision without prejudice as to sealing motions, maintaining status quo, subject to future briefing as discussed.;*
- 12/04/2019  **Minute Order** (5:11 PM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)  
*Motions re Arbitration Award  
Minute Order - No Hearing Held;  
Journal Entry Details:  
After a review and consideration of the points and authorities on file herein, the Court determined as follows: First, the Court will address collectively Defendant News + Media Capital Group, LLC s and the Review Journal s ( Review Journal ) Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and then Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. s ( LV Sun ) Motion to confirm the Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award in Part. The first issue raised by the Review Journal as the basis to vacate the Arbitrator s Award, focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the Joint Operating Agreement (JOA) by failing to subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the LV Sun s share of profits under the JOA. Under Nevada Law, [t] he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-law ground relied upon for challenging the award. Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White, 133 Nev. 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) quoting Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC, 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d*



**CASE SUMMARY**  
**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

172, 176 (2004). Additionally, [t]here are two common-law grounds recognized in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator manifestly disregarded the law. *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the distinction between the two as: the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement, while the latter standard ensures that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law. *Id.* Moreover, [j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is extremely limited. *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration. *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the law, but whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a particular result, simply disregarded the law. *Id.* In the instant action, the Arbitrator recognized the JOA's plain language, considered its EBITDA, and determined that under the JOA deductions should be calculated for editorial expenses. Thus, there appears to be, at a minimum, a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this issue. The Arbitrator concluded: The term Retention was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of Retention included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits payments to the Sun. Arbitrator's Decision at page 5. Consequently, the Court finds that the Defendant Review Journal has failed to meet its burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses. Next, the Arbitrator focused on Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. After he weighed the evidence, he concluded that under his interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator noted: The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun. There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the audit awarded in this matter could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA. Arbitrator's Decision at page 6. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses. Next, the Court reviews Defendant Review Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation regarding the ordered audit. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court noted: "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev., Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular, "[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards outside the scope of the governing contract." *Id.* "However, allegations that an arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator's powers." *Id.* Moreover, "[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement." *Id.* at 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, "[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was correctly decided." *Id.* Therefore, "[a]n award should be enforced so long as the arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract" and "there is a colorable justification for the outcome." *Id.* Nonetheless, "[t]he deference accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express language of the contract." *Int'l Ass'n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991). *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provide that Plaintiff LV Sun has a right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted: Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to appoint an certified public accounting firm or law firm as Sun's representative to examine and audit the books and

## CASE SUMMARY

### CASE NO. A-18-772591-B



records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments (this provision has been referred to by both parties as audit ). Respondent indicated that an audit has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an audit . In accordance with the scope of this tribunal s authority, Claimant s request for an audit is granted. Claimant may undertake the audit for the periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018) and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that this award, if an audit be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the audit . This award does not define the scope of the audit as part of the award as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal s authority. Arbitrator s Decision, page 6. In review of the Arbitrator s decision, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines. It is clear in review of the Arbitrator s decision he was well aware of the limits of his authority and simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an audit. Thus, a non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate an arbitration decision. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court s review of the arbitrary-and- capricious standard is limited to whether the arbitrator s findings are supported by substantial evidence in the record. Washoe, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator s award based on a misinterpretation of the law. Id. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial evidence to support the Arbitrator s Award. Finally, although the Court has addressed the primary contested issues raised by Defendant Review Journal in its Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, the Court will briefly address the issues raised by the LV Sun. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were not additional promotional activities and expenses. The LV Sun argues that the Arbitrator s ruling is arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court Affirms the Arbitrator s ruling. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the LV Sun s tortious breach claims. The Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts vs. torts. Further, the Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA that the tort claims potentially applied. Although it s not set forth in detail how the Arbitrator evaluated the party s unique relationship, it appears he determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue, and therefore, he found that the party s conduct does not qualify for tortious breach. Consequently, the Court cannot find that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the law or the JOA or that the decision was arbitrary and capricious. Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys fees, costs, and the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorney s fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his ruling. Accordingly, the Court Affirms the Arbitrator s ruling on costs and fees. Lastly, the LV Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the Review Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator noted that while the Review Journal has done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an audit, yet he determined that the Review Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed. As a result of the foregoing, the Review Journal s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award shall be DENIED. The LV Sun s Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part shall be GRANTED in Part and DENIED in Part. The LV Sun s motion is granted as to the request to confirm the Arbitration Award. The LV Sun s motion is denied as to all requests to vacate, modify, or correct the Arbitrator s Award. Lastly, the Review Journal s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part shall be GRANTED in Part and DENIED in Part. The Review Journal s countermotion is granted as to the request to confirm the Arbitration Award. The Review Journal s countermotion is denied as to the request to vacate the Arbitration Award. Lastly, in order to alleviate any potential misunderstanding in light of the confusing procedural posture of the pleadings and request for relief in this case, it is the Court s intention to AFFIRM the entire Arbitration Decision as written. Counsel for Plaintiff shall prepare a detailed Order, Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law, based not

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

*only on the foregoing Minute Order, but also on the record on file herein. This is to be submitted to adverse counsel for review and approval and/or submission of a competing Order or objections, prior to submitting to the Court for review and signature. CLERK S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.;*

12/11/2019	<p><b>CANCELED Motion to Modify or Dissolve TPO</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Vacated</i></p> <p><i>News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Modify Protective Order on Order Shortening Time</i></p>
01/09/2020	<p><b>CANCELED Pretrial/Calendar Call</b> (10:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Vacated - per Stipulation and Order</i></p>
01/10/2020	<p> <b>Minute Order</b> (11:45 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Motions re: Sealing of Documents</i></p> <p><i>Minute Order - No Hearing Held;</i></p> <p><i>Journal Entry Details:</i></p> <p><i>On January 9, 2020, a stay was entered in this case. Therefore, the Court hereby vacates the pending motions under submission regarding sealing of documents. In the event of the stay being lifted, these matters will renew for consideration and decision. CLERK S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.;</i></p>
01/22/2020	<p><b>CANCELED Status Check</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Vacated</i></p> <p><i>Status Check re Trial Readiness</i></p>
01/27/2020	<p><b>CANCELED Jury Trial</b> (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Vacated - per Stipulation and Order</i></p>
01/29/2020	<p> <b>Motion for Leave</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>News+Media Capital Group LLC And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion For Leave To File Additional Briefing Requested By Court On Order Shortening Time</i></p> <p><i>Motion Granted;</i></p> <p><i>Journal Entry Details:</i></p> <p><i>Upon Court's inquiry as to federal action status, Mr. Gayan advised Motions to Dismiss fully briefed, hearings not set, his client moved to stay pending dismissal, conference report submitted, and there is a 2/4/20 hearing before Magistrate on stay issue and the report. Arguments by Mr. Gayan and Mr. Smith regarding the instant Motion. Court stated there appears jurisdiction on the issue. COURT ORDERED, Motion For Leave To File Additional Briefing Requested By Court GRANTED. Colloquy regarding briefing and hearing schedule as to sealing issue and modification of stipulated protective order. There being agreement, COURT FURTHER ORDERED, briefing and hearing as follows: Motion DUE 2/12/20; Opposition DUE 2/26/20; Reply DUE 3/4/20; Hearing SET 3/11/20. Court directed Mr. Gayan to prepare today's order. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, 2/19/20 Status Check matters VACATED. 3/11/20 9:30 AM HEARING ON SEALING AND MODIFICATION ISSUE</i></p> <p><i>CLERK'S NOTE: Subsequent to proceedings, Court hereby clarifies as to the briefing there will be no strict page number limit; parties are to follow customary limit pursuant to the Rules. This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.;</i></p>
02/05/2020	<p><b>CANCELED Motion for Leave</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Vacated</i></p> <p><i>Plaintiff/Counter Defendant - Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 7 and 9 to Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims or, Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action and References Thereto</i></p>
02/05/2020	<p><b>CANCELED Motion for Protective Order</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)</p> <p><i>Vacated</i></p> <p><i>Motion for Protective Order Staying Discovery Pending Resolution of Sun's Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims, or Alternatively, to Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action</i></p>
02/05/2020	<p><b>CANCELED Motion to Seal/Redact Records</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy</p>

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

**CASE SUMMARY**  
**CASE NO. A-18-772591-B**

	C.) <i>Vacated</i> <i>Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal [Exhibits 5, 7, and 9 to Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Opposition to Defendants' Emergency Motion to Stay Case and Postpone Action on Arbitration-Related Motions on OST and References Thereto]</i>
02/05/2020	<b>CANCELED Opposition and Countermotion</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Vacated</i> <i>News+Media Capital Group LLC's And Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s (1) Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For Protective Order Staying Discovery Pending Resolution Of Sun's Motion To Dismiss Counterclaims, Or Alternatively, To Stay Counterclaims Pending Federal Court Action, And In The Alternative, (2) Countermotion To Stay All Discovery</i>
02/19/2020	<b>CANCELED Status Check</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Vacated</i> <i>Status Check: Stay for Federal Action/Rescheduling Motions from 2/5/20 vacated per stay</i>
02/19/2020	<b>CANCELED Status Check</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Vacated</i> <i>Status Check: Decision on Pending Motions re Sealing of Documents</i>
03/11/2020	<b>Hearing</b> (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Hearing on Sealing and Modification Issue</i>
04/23/2020	<b>CANCELED Pretrial/Calendar Call</b> (10:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Vacated</i>
05/06/2020	<b>Status Check: Trial Readiness</b> (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)
05/11/2020	<b>CANCELED Jury Trial</b> (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.) <i>Vacated</i>
05/28/2020	<b>Pretrial/Calendar Call</b> (10:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)
06/15/2020	<b>Jury Trial</b> (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Williams, Timothy C.)

DATE	FINANCIAL INFORMATION
	<b>Counter Claimant</b> Las Vegas Review-Journal Inc
	Total Charges 181.50
	Total Payments and Credits 181.50
	<b>Balance Due as of 1/30/2020 0.00</b>
	<b>Defendant</b> News+Media Capital Group LLC
	Total Charges 2,033.00
	Total Payments and Credits 2,033.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 1/30/2020 0.00</b>
	<b>Counter Defendant</b> Las Vegas Sun Inc
	Total Charges 2,052.00
	Total Payments and Credits 2,052.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 1/30/2020 0.00</b>

# BUSINESS COURT CIVIL COVER SHEET

Clark County, Nevada

A-18-772591-B

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
(Assigned by Clerk's Office)

Department 13

## I. Party Information (provide both home and mailing addresses if different)

Plaintiff(s) (name/address/phone): Las Vegas Sun, Inc., a Nevada corporation    Attorney (name/address/phone): E. Leif Reid, Esq. Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP One East Liberty St., Ste. 300 Reno, NV 89501	Defendant(s) (name/address/phone): News+Media Capital Group LLC & Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.    Attorney (name/address/phone):    
---	--


## II. Nature of Controversy (Please check the applicable boxes for both the civil case type and business court case type)

☐ Arbitration Requested

Civil Case Filing Types		Business Court Filing Types		
<b>Real Property</b> <b>Landlord/Tenant</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Unlawful Detainer <input type="checkbox"/> Other Landlord/Tenant <b>Title to Property</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Judicial Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> Other Title to Property <b>Other Real Property</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Condemnation/Eminent Domain <input type="checkbox"/> Other Real Property  <b>Construction Defect &amp; Contract</b> <b>Construction Defect</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Chapter 40 <input type="checkbox"/> Other Construction Defect <b>Contract Case</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Uniform Commercial Code <input type="checkbox"/> Building and Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance Carrier <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> Collection of Accounts <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Other Contract	<b>Torts</b> <b>Negligence</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Auto <input type="checkbox"/> Premises Liability <input type="checkbox"/> Other Negligence <b>Malpractice</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Medical/Dental <input type="checkbox"/> Legal <input type="checkbox"/> Accounting <input type="checkbox"/> Other Malpractice  <b>Other Torts</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> Intentional Misconduct <input type="checkbox"/> Employment Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Other Tort  <b>Civil Writs</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of Habeas Corpus <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of Mandamus <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of Quo Warrant <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of Prohibition <input type="checkbox"/> Other Civil Writ	<b>CLARK COUNTY BUSINESS COURT</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NRS Chapters 78-89 <input type="checkbox"/> Commodities (NRS 91) <input type="checkbox"/> Securities (NRS 90) <input type="checkbox"/> Mergers (NRS 92A) <input type="checkbox"/> Uniform Commercial Code (NRS 104) <input type="checkbox"/> Purchase/Sale of Stock, Assets, or Real Estate <input type="checkbox"/> Trademark or Trade Name (NRS 600) <input type="checkbox"/> Enhanced Case Management <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Business Court Matters  <b>WASHOE COUNTY BUSINESS COURT</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NRS Chapters 78-88 <input type="checkbox"/> Commodities (NRS 91) <input type="checkbox"/> Securities (NRS 90) <input type="checkbox"/> Investments (NRS 104 Art.8) <input type="checkbox"/> Deceptive Trade Practices (NRS 598) <input type="checkbox"/> Trademark/Trade Name (NRS 600) <input type="checkbox"/> Trade Secrets (NRS 600A) <input type="checkbox"/> Enhanced Case Management <input type="checkbox"/> Other Business Court Matters		
<b>Judicial Review/Appeal/Other Civil Filing</b> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"> <b>Judicial Review</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Foreclosure Mediation Case  <b>Appeal Other</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal from Lower Court                         </td> <td style="width: 50%;"> <b>Other Civil Filing</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Judgment  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Civil Matters                         </td> </tr> </table>		<b>Judicial Review</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Foreclosure Mediation Case <b>Appeal Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal from Lower Court	<b>Other Civil Filing</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Judgment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Civil Matters	
<b>Judicial Review</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Foreclosure Mediation Case <b>Appeal Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal from Lower Court	<b>Other Civil Filing</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Judgment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Civil Matters			

April 9, 2018

Date

  
 Signature of initiating party or representative



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**  
14  
15 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

16 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B

Dept. No.: XVI

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD**

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 "Motions").

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

### 12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the "JOA").

#### 15 ***The Sun's Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the "Sun") filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the "Review-Journal") in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun's motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 ***The Arbitration Award***

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 ***The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award***

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 ***The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award***

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to



1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial

1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
13 the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
14 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
15 There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
16 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
17 expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las*  
15 *Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious

1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 ***The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,***  
9 ***Modify or Correct the Award, in Part***

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.

1           28.     Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs and  
2 the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorneys'  
3 fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of  
4 the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a  
5 consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds  
6 that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his  
7 ruling. Accordingly, the Court affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on attorneys' fees and costs.

8           29.     Lastly, the Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the  
9 Review-Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator determined that the  
10 Review-Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered  
11 that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

12                                 **ORDER**

13           IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Arbitration  
14 Award is confirmed in its entirety.

15           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the  
16 Arbitration Award is DENIED.

17           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm  
18 Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in  
19 Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED  
20 IN PART as provided for herein.

21     ///

22  
23  
24  
25     ///  
26  
27  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com


1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.

6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams

9 Submitted by:

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP


11  
12  #136210

13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18 *Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
1/28/2020 4:52 PM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
Delaware limited liability company; and  
LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company,

Defendants.

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware corporation,

Counterclaimant,

v.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: 16

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF  
FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND  
ORDER AFFIRMING THE  
ARBITRATION AWARD**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the **FINDINGS OF**  
2 **FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION**  
3 **AWARD** was entered in the above-entitled matter on January 28, 2020, a copy of which is  
4 attached hereto.

5 DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

6 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

7  
8 /s/ Michael Gayan

9 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
10 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
11 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
12 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

14 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
15 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
16 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
17 JENNER & BLOCK  
18 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
19 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

20 *Attorneys for Defendants*


21 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

22 I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of  
23 the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF**  
24 **LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION AWARD** via the Court's  
25 electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules,  
26 Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

27 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

28 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP





KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**  
14  
15 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

16 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD**

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.’s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.’s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.’s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 “Motions”).

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

#### 12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.’s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the “JOA”).

#### 15 ***The Sun’s Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the “Review-Journal”) in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun’s motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 ***The Arbitration Award***

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 ***The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award***

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 ***The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award***

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial

1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
13 the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
14 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
15 There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
16 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
17 expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las*  
15 *Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious

1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 ***The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,***  
9 ***Modify or Correct the Award, in Part***

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.



28. Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs and the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorneys' fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his ruling. Accordingly, the Court affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on attorneys' fees and costs.

29. Lastly, the Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the Review-Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator determined that the Review-Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

**ORDER**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Arbitration Award is confirmed in its entirety.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as provided for herein.

///


///



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.

6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams

9 Submitted by:

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11  
12 Madeira Z Vela #13626  
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
*Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**August 22, 2018**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**August 22, 2018**

**2:27 PM**

**Minute Order**

**Minute Order:  
Recusal**

**HEARD BY:** Denton, Mark R.

**COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** April Watkins

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES  
PRESENT:**

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- GIVEN the Court s previous professional relationship with one of the parties and its previous professional and long-time personal friendship with principals of the same, and to avoid the appearance of impropriety, the Court RECUSES from further involvement in this case and directs that it be reassigned to another Business Court Department. CANON 2, Rule 2.11, Commentary [1].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

CLERK S NOTE: This Minute Order was electronically served by Courtroom Clerk, April Watkins, to all registered parties for Odyssey File & serve. aw

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**October 24, 2018**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**October 24, 2018      9:00 AM      All Pending Motions**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Dana J. Tavaglione

**PARTIES**

**PRESENT:**      Martini, Kristen L.      Attorney  
Pocker, Richard J.      Attorney  
Reid, Leif      Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Robert Cauthorn, representative of Las Vegas Sun, present.

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS...PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION

Arguments by counsel on Motions. Court stated ITS FINDINGS and ORDERED, Motion to Dismiss DENIED; Motion to Compel GRANTED. Pltf. to prepare order and circulate to counsel.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**December 04, 2018**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**December 04, 2018      9:00 AM      Motion**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

**PRESENT:**      Martini, Kristen L.      Attorney  
                 Pocker, Richard J.      Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Robert Cauthorn, representative of Las Vegas Sun, present.

Matter of Motion to Extend Deadline for the Filing of Defendants Response to Plaintiffs Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and to Vacate and Reschedule Hearing on Order Shortening Time (First Request).

Arguments by counsel. Colloquy regarding possible continuance of all pending matters and scheduling briefing. COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED; Response to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment DUE 12/10/18; Reply thereto DUE 12/17/18 by 12:00 p.m. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, following matters CONTINUED: Pltf's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Defts' Motion for Reconsideration on Order Shortening Time.

CONTINUED TO: 12/19/18 1:15 P.M.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**December 19, 2018**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**December 19, 2018      1:15 PM      All Pending Motions**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

**PRESENT:**      Martini, Kristen L.      Attorney  
                 Pocker, Richard J.      Attorney  
                 Reid, Leif      Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Nicole Scott, Esq. present for Pltf. Las Vegas Sun. Representatives of Las Vegas Sun present: Brian Greenspun, Myra Greenspun, and Robert Cauthorn, present.

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF COURT'S ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION AND DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, AND REQUEST FOR STAY ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME  
Arguments by counsel. COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED; Ms. Martini to prepare detailed amended order within a week.

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND BREACH OF CONTRACT/SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE  
Arguments by counsel. Court advised decision forthcoming within a week.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**February 04, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**February 04, 2019      8:13 AM      Minute Order**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES  
PRESENT:**

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- After a review and consideration of the points and authorities on file herein, and the argument of counsel, the Court determined as follows:

The Court has reviewed the issues raised by Plaintiff, Las Vegas, Sun, Inc. (LVS) in its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief and Breach of Contract/Specific Performance (First and Fourth Claims for Relief).

It is clear that the Joint Operating Agreement (JOA) is binding and controls the contractual relationship as to LVS and the News+Media Capital Group, LLC. (News-Media). However, issues as to whether there is a material breach of Section 5.1 and Appendices A and B of the JOA by Defendant, News-Media are questions of fact and not the proper basis to support granting summary judgment at this time. Additionally, the remedy of specific performance is only available as an alternative claim to monetary damage where the remedy at law is inadequate. It is premature at this time to reach such a conclusion. Ultimately, the Court anticipates that all issues of compliance and/or breach of Section 5.1 and Appendices A and B of the JOA will require expert testimony to assist the trier of fact in reaching their decision in this matter.

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff LVS s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for Declaratory Relief

PRINT DATE:      01/30/2020      Page 5 of 32      Minutes Date:      August 22, 2018

and Breach of Contract for Specific Performance (First and Fourth Claims for Relief) shall be DENIED.

Counsel for News-Media shall prepare a detailed Order, Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law, based not only on the foregoing Minute Order, but also on the record on file herein. This is to be submitted to adverse counsel for review and approval and/or submission of a competing Order or objections, prior to submitting to the Court for review and signature.

CLERK S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**April 03, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**April 03, 2019      9:15 AM      Mandatory Rule 16  
Conference**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES**

**PRESENT:**      Levin, Akke      Attorney  
                         Martini, Kristen L.      Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Matter of Mandatory Discovery Conference. Ms. Martini advised related arbitration begins 4/15/19 and concludes 4/26/19. Colloquy regarding impact of the arbitration as to discovery proceeding in this case and claims anticipated for trial. Court stated 2 weeks to be set aside for trial. As to witnesses, Ms. Martini advised 13 total which accounts for 3 duplicates. Ms. Levin advised a confidentiality and protective order and ESI to be negotiated. There being agreement, COURT ORDERED, Trial dates SET; Close of Discovery SET 9/27/19. Department to issue scheduling order.

1/9/20 10:30 AM PRETRIAL/CALENDAR CALL

1/27/20 9:30 AM BENCH TRIAL



**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Other Business Court Matters

COURT MINUTES

August 21, 2019

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

**August 21, 2019      9:00 AM      Motion for Protective      See 9/4/19 Minute**  
**Order      Order**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Jones, Jon   Randall	Attorney
	Levin, Akke	Attorney
	Martini, Kristen L.	Attorney
	Scott, Nicole	Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Benjamin Lipman, Esq. also present as General Counsel for Las Vegas Review-Journal.

Matter of Review-Journal's Motion for Protective Order and Objections Under NRCP 45. Mr. Jones argued for opportunity for review and privilege log, and for expansive view as to a representative. Ms. Martini proposed monthly case management conferences and argued burden not met as to whether fact witness at issue covered. Court stated decision to issue next week by way of Minute Order. Colloquy regarding proposed monthly conferences. Court stated if efforts to resolve issue discussed are unsuccessful, Court will entertain motion on order shortening time from Ms. Martini.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters****COURT MINUTES****September 04, 2019**

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
    vs.  
    News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

**September 04, 2019      12:12 AM      Minute Order**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES  
PRESENT:**

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- After review and consideration of the arguments of counsel and the moving papers on file herein, the Court determined as follows:

Upon reflection, the Court has considered Defendant News+Media Capital Group, LLC and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc. s (Collectively the R.J.s ) Motion for a Protective Order as it relates to Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. s (LV Sun) Notice of Subpoena Duces Tecum regarding the files of J. Ford Huffman. According to the declaration of Keith Moyer dated August 14, 2019, Mr. Huffman was retained to perform two functions. The first task was to assist R.J. employees and managers in the redesign of the newspaper, including the LV Sun insert portion of the newspaper. Mr. Huffman also consulted with and assisted the R.J. as a litigation consultant in responding to the LV Sun s Motion for Summary Judgment. The Court is well aware of positions asserted by the parties and would probably be required to conduct an evidentiary hearing to determine if Mr. Huffman s role in assisting the R.J. rose to the level of functional equivalent of an employee and thus subject to attorney client privilege. Additionally, Defendant R.J. alleges that Mr. Huffman was retained as a litigation consultant resulting in the application of the work product doctrine. Considering the totality of the arguments presented, without a more developed record, it is uncertain as to whether the functional equivalent doctrine applies at this time. However, it is patently apparent that Mr. Huffman has been retained by Defendant R.J. in the dual capacity to work on the newspaper redesign and as a litigation

PRINT DATE:      01/30/2020

Page 9 of 32

Minutes Date:      August 22, 2018

consultant. As a result of Mr. Huffman's dual capacity, the Court will take a cautious approach to the production of documents in Mr. Huffman's possession. In order to prevent the inadvertent disclosure of privileged documents, the Court feels that in order to save time and expedite discovery in this matter and without the necessity of an evidentiary hearing, the Court shall require Mr. Huffman to supply all documents in his possession to Defendant R.J., who then shall be required to prepare a privilege log identifying all documents with particularity and assert the basis, if any, for privileged documents for the record. The privileged log shall be prepared and exchanged by counsel within ten days from entry of this Court's order. In addition, the Court shall set a status check on 10/16/2019 at 9:00AM to expedite the discovery and to address the applicability of any asserted privileges. Consequently, Defendant R.J.'s Motion for Protective Order shall be Granted in Part as to potential work product privileged based on work as a litigation consultant and Denied in Part as to the functional equivalent employer classifications.

Counsel for Defendant R.J. shall prepare a detailed Order, Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law, based not only on the foregoing Minute Order, but also on the record on file herein. This is to be submitted to adverse counsel for review and approval and/or submission of a competing Order or objections, prior to submitting to the Court for review and signature.

CLERK'S NOTE: The above Minute Order has been corrected with regards to the status check date as was brought to the Court's attention. The initial 10/4/19 setting was a date on which the Court is unavailable; the correct status check date is 10/16/19 at 9:00 a.m. as reflected above. This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile. /cd 9-26-19/

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**September 25, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**September 25, 2019    9:00 AM      Motion for Leave**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Gayan, Michael J	Attorney
	Jones, Jon Randall	Attorney
	Martini, Kristen L.	Attorney
	Pisanelli, James J	Attorney
	Reid, Leif	Attorney
	Scott, Nicole	Attorney
	Smith, Jordan T., ESQ	Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Representatives of Pltf. present: Brian Greenspun, Myra Greenspun, and Amy Greenspun. Benjamin Lipman, Esq. present as General Counsel for Deft. Las Vegas Review-Journal. Attorney David Singer, Pro Hac pending, present for Defts.

Matter of Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Assert Counterclaim on Order Shortening Time. Mr. Jones requested pending Motions to Associate Counsel David Singer, Amy Gallegos, and Richard Stone be granted. Mr. Reid advised no opposition to the Motions. COURT ORDERED, Motions to Associate Counsel GRANTED. Arguments by Mr. Jones and Mr. Pisanelli regarding Motion for Leave. COURT ORDERED, Motion for Leave GRANTED; no rights have been waived. Mr. Jones advised will prepare the order and circulate to counsel.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Other Business Court Matters

COURT MINUTES

October 22, 2019

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

**October 22, 2019      1:30 PM      All Pending Motions**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Gayan, Michael J	Attorney
	Jones, Jon Randall	Attorney
	Martini, Kristen L.	Attorney
	Pisanelli, James J	Attorney
	Reid, Leif	Attorney
	Scott, Nicole	Attorney
	Smith, Jordan T., ESQ	Attorney
	Stone, Richard L.	Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Benjamin Lipman, Esq. present as General Counsel for Deft. Las Vegas Review-Journal.

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART...DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO VACATE ARBITRATION AWARD

Argument by Mr. Reid. CONFERENCE AT BENCH. Arguments by Mr. Reid and Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones provided document for Court's review. Colloquy regarding scheduling other pending matters from today. As to the Arbitration Motions, Court stated will issue decision after review of issues regarding exceeding powers, common law, sufficient evidence, and manifest disregard. COURT

ORDERED, outstanding pending matters from today CONTINUED.

CONTINUED TO: 10/31/19 1:00 PM PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD...DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO MOTION TO VACATE...PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND ANSWER AND ASSERT COUNTERCLAIM...PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS...STATUS CHECK: EXPEDITED DISCOVERY AND APPLICABILITY OF ASSERTED PRIVILEGES

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**October 31, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**October 31, 2019      1:00 PM      All Pending Motions**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

**PRESENT:** Jones, Jon Randall      Attorney  
Kaveh, Mona      Attorney  
Martini, Kristen L.      Attorney  
Pisanelli, James J      Attorney  
Reid, Leif      Attorney  
Smith, Jordan T., ESQ      Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

**- PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

Arguments by Ms. Martini and Mr. Jones. COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED; documents must be provided; no sanctions at this time in light of third-party issues. Colloquy regarding a status check as to outstanding issues and electronically stored information ("ESI"). COURT FURTHER ORDERED, Status Check regarding same SET for time of 11/6/19 matters hearing.

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD...PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AS TO OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND ANSWER AND ASSERT COUNTERCLAIM...DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL

Arguments by Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones. Discussion regarding an appendix with tabs for submission

PRINT DATE:      01/30/2020      Page 14 of 32      Minutes Date:      August 22, 2018

of the Motions. Court directed the supplement delivered by Monday next week for a decision.

STATUS CHECK: EXPEDITED DISCOVERY AND APPLICABILITY OF ASSERTED PRIVILEGES  
Court noted matter previously addressed.

11/4/19 3:00 AM (CHAMBERS) STATUS CHECK: SUPPLEMENT TO MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO  
FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL

11/6/19 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY AND ESI



**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**November 06, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**November 06, 2019      9:00 AM      All Pending Motions**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Gayan, Michael J	Attorney
	Jones, Jon Randall	Attorney
	Kaveh, Mona	Attorney
	Martini, Kristen L.	Attorney
	Reid, Leif	Attorney
	Scott, Nicole	Attorney
	Smith, Jordan T., ESQ	Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Robert Cauthorn, COO of Las Vegas Sun, also present.

DEFENDANTS MOTION TO SEAL OPPOSITION AND EXHIBITS A-K...MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL [THE SUN'S OPPOSITION AND EXHIBITS TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO VACATE ARBITRATION AWARD]

Arguments by Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones. Court stated will review matters and issue detailed minute order shortly. Court further stated records at issue remain in their current state until time of the order. Colloquy regarding supplementation provided today by counsel as relates to forthcoming decision on sealing Motions. Court stated it sought documents Arbitrator was relying upon, namely, the joint operating agreements. Court also stated no preclusion from supplementing the matter further. Mr. Gayan advised will provide a supplement by tomorrow or Friday.

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT...DEFENDANTS' (1) LIMITED OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT AND (2) COUNTERMOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL

Arguments by Mr. Reid and Mr. Jones. COURT ORDERED, Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint GRANTED. Prevailing party to prepare the order. Discussion and argument by counsel regarding Countermotion to Continue Trial in light of two new claims. As to the Countermotion, COURT FURTHER ORDERED, case schedule as follows: Initial Experts 1/20/20; Rebuttal Experts 2/19/20; Close of Discovery 4/20/20; Dispositive Motions 5/18/20; Trial 6/15/20. Department to issue amended trial order.

STATUS CHECK: OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY AND ESI...DEFENDANTS NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL, INC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND CONDITIONAL COUNTERMOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE THE AWARD, IN PART

Colloquy regarding rescheduling remaining matters from today as well as 11/13/19 matters. COURT ORDERED, today's pending matters CONTINUED to 11/12/19 afternoon; 11/13/19 matters RESET to same 11/12/19 session.

CONTINUED TO: 11/12/19 1:15 PM STATUS CHECK: OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY AND ESI...DEFENDANTS NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL, INC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND CONDITIONAL COUNTERMOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE THE AWARD, IN PART

11/12/19 1:15 PM DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL...MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL [EXHIBITS 3-6 TO REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND REFERENCES THERETO]

5/28/20 10:30 AM PRETRIAL/CALENDAR CALL

6/15/20 9:30 AM JURY TRIAL

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**November 12, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**November 12, 2019      1:15 PM      All Pending Motions**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Dana J. Tavaglione

**PARTIES**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Gayan, Michael J	Attorney
	Jones, Jon Randall	Attorney
	Pisanelli, James J	Attorney
	Reid, Leif	Attorney
	Scott, Nicole	Attorney
	Smith, Jordan T., ESQ	Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL [EXHIBITS 3-6 TO REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND REFERENCES THERETO]...DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL

Matters submitted. Court stated will decide all seal issues together and notify counsel if assistance needed.

DEFENDANTS NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL, INC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE OR ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFY OR CORRECT THE AWARD, IN PART, AND CONDITIONAL COUNTERMOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD, IN PART, AND TO VACATE THE AWARD, IN PART

PRINT DATE: 01/30/2020

Page 18 of 32

Minutes Date: August 22, 2018

Mr. Gayan presented binder of materials for Court's review. Court noted receipt of materials needed for decision on the confirmation or vacate matter; decision anticipated before Thanksgiving Holiday.

**STATUS CHECK: OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY AND ESI**

Mr. Reid advised Ms. Martini unable to attend due to health issue. Mr. Gayan reviewed history of issues with vendor, the rational review, and custodians. Upon inquiry by Mr. Reid as to prior production compelled, Mr. Gayan advised will provide within two (2) weeks and earlier if possible. Court so noted. Discussion and arguments by counsel regarding custodians, search terms with respect to those involved in redesign, and second set of outstanding discovery. Mr. Jones presented documents for Court's review. Mr. Jones advised will perform search as discussed. Colloquy regarding special setting for results of ESI search and related issues as well as the Motion to Dismiss previously set 11/20. COURT ORDERED, Motion to Dismiss REST from 11/20/19 9:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.; Status Check SET 11/20/19 at 10:00 a.m. as to the ESI search, custodian issues, and second set of outstanding discovery. Mr. Reid advised will prepare order from today's hearing.

**11/20/19 10:00 AM STATUS CHECK: RESULTS OF ESI SEARCH/CUSTODIAN ISSUES/SECOND SET OF OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY**

**CONTINUED TO: 11/20/19 10:00 AM MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTERCLAIMS OR, ALTERNATIVELY, TO STAY COUNTERCLAIMS PENDING FEDERAL COURT ACTION**

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**November 20, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**November 20, 2019      10:00 AM      All Pending Motions**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

**PRESENT:**

Gayan, Michael J	Attorney
Jones, Jon Randall	Attorney
Pisanelli, James J	Attorney
Reid, Leif	Attorney
Scott, Nicole	Attorney
Smith, Jordan T., ESQ	Attorney
Stone, Richard L.	Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Benjamin Lipman, Esq. present as General Counsel for Deft. Las Vegas Review Journal.

MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTERCLAIMS OR, ALTERNATIVELY, TO STAY COUNTERCLAIMS  
PENDING FEDERAL COURT ACTION...STATUS CHECK: RESULTS OF ESI  
SEARCH/CUSTODIAN ISSUES/SECOND SET OF OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY

Arguments by Mr. Pisanelli and Mr. Jones regarding the Motion. COURT ORDERED, as to Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims, claims have merit until final adjudication; as to alternative Motion to Stay, matter stayed; will reserve ruling on subject matter jurisdiction and defer to pending resolution of action in Federal Court; Status Check SET in ninety (90) days regarding stay as to federal action. Colloquy regarding stay of entire case in light of anticipated issues with discovery. Court stated

PRINT DATE:      01/30/2020      Page 20 of 32      Minutes Date:      August 22, 2018

counsel may file appropriate motion for stay on order shortening time with setting not less than ten (10) days for response. Court directed Mr. Pisanell prepare today's Motion order and circulate to counsel. As to today's Status Check, Mr. Reid advised the production outstanding of six months is promised next week. Court stated today's stay is not for purpose of the production. Mr. Gayan reviewed extensive search results, advised parties have agreed on certain terms and anticipates parties will meet and confer on issues. There being agreement, COURT ORDERED, Status Check matter CONTINUED to 12/4/19.

CONTINUED TO: 12/4/19 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: RESULTS OF ESI SEARCH/CUSTODIAN ISSUES/SECOND SET OF OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY

2/19/20 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: STAY FOR FEDERAL ACTION

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**November 27, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**November 27, 2019      9:42 AM      Minute Order**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES  
PRESENT:**

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- At the prior hearing in the instant matter, the Court restated its intention to publish a decision by a minute order on Defendants , New+MEDIA Capital Group LLC; Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc. (The RJ), Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and the Plaintiff s, Las Vegas Sun, Inc., Countermotion to Confirm the Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate the Award in Part before November 28, 2019. The Court has reviewed the parties submissions and has finalized its decision and minute order. However, in light of the recent filing by the RJ seeking to stay all aspects of this case, the Court believes out of fairness it cannot publish its decision until after a hearing on the merits of the RJ s Motion to Stay is held.

CLERK'S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**December 04, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**December 04, 2019      9:30 AM      All Pending Motions**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Gayan, Michael J	Attorney
	Jones, Jon Randall	Attorney
	Martini, Kristen L.	Attorney
	Pisanelli, James J	Attorney
	Reid, Leif	Attorney
	Singer, David R.	Attorney
	Smith, Jordan T., ESQ	Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Robert Cauthorn, COO for Pltf. Las Vegas Sun, present. Representatives of Pltf. present: Brian Greenspun and Myra Greenspun. Benjamin Lipman, Esq. present as General Counsel for Deft. Las Vegas Review-Journal. Representative of Deft. Las Vegas Review-Journal, Keith Moyer, present.

EWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY CASE AND POSTPONE ACTION ON ARBITRATION-RELATED MOTIONS ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME...LAS VEGAS SUN, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY CASE AND POSTPONE ACTION ON ARBITRATION-RELATED MOTIONS ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME AND COUNTERMOTION TO STAY DEFENDANTS' TENTH, TWENTY-SIXTH AND TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES (REDACTED)...STATUS CHECK:

PRINT DATE:      01/30/2020      Page 23 of 32      Minutes Date:      August 22, 2018



**DECISION ON MOTION TO CONFIRM ARBITRATION AWARD; MOTION TO VACATE  
ARBITRATION AWARD...STATUS CHECK: RESULTS OF ESI SEARCH/CUSTODIAN  
ISSUES/SECOND SET OF OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY**

Arguments by Mr. Jones and Mr. Pisanelli. COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART; DENIED as to issue with respect to decision on arbitration; will stay all other case matters. Prevailing party to submit the order. Court stated a minute order is anticipated today as to arbitration confirmation or vacation. Further stated will issue decision without prejudice as to sealing motions, maintaining status quo, subject to future briefing as discussed.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**December 04, 2019**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**December 04, 2019      5:11 PM      Minute Order**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES  
PRESENT:**

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- After a review and consideration of the points and authorities on file herein, the Court determined as follows:

First, the Court will address collectively Defendant News + Media Capital Group, LLC s and the Review Journal s ( Review Journal ) Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and then Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. s ( LV Sun ) Motion to confirm the Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award in Part.

The first issue raised by the Review Journal as the basis to vacate the Arbitrator s Award, focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the Joint Operating Agreement (JOA) by failing to subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the LV Sun s share of profits under the JOA.

Under Nevada Law, [t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-law ground relied upon for challenging the award. Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White, 133 Nev. 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) quoting Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC, 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004).

PRINT DATE:      01/30/2020      Page 25 of 32      Minutes Date:      August 22, 2018

Additionally, [t]here are two common-law grounds recognized in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator manifestly disregarded the law. *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the distinction between the two as: the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement, while the latter standard ensures that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law. *Id.*

Moreover, [j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is extremely limited. *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration. *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the law, but whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a particular result, simply disregarded the law. *Id.*

In the instant action, the Arbitrator recognized the JOA's plain language, considered its EBITDA, and determined that under the JOA deductions should be calculated for editorial expenses. Thus, there appears to be, at a minimum, a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

The term Retention was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of Retention included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits payments to the Sun.

Arbitrator's Decision at page 5.

Consequently, the Court finds that the Defendant Review Journal has failed to meet its burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

Next, the Arbitrator focused on Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. After he weighed the evidence, he concluded that under his interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator noted:

The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments

to the Sun. There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the audit awarded in this matter could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

Arbitrator's Decision at page 6.

In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

Next, the Court reviews Defendant Review Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation regarding the ordered audit.

In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court noted:

"The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev., Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular, "[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards outside the scope of the governing contract." *Id.* "However, allegations that an arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator's powers." *Id.* Moreover, "[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement." *Id.* at 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, "[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was correctly decided." *Id.* Therefore, "[a]n award should be enforced so long as the arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract" and "there is a colorable justification for the outcome." *Id.* Nonetheless, "[t]he deference accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express language of the contract." *Int'l Ass'n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

*Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provide that Plaintiff LV Sun has a right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to appoint an certified public accounting firm or law firm as Sun's representative to examine and audit the books and records of the Review-Journal

and the other publications whose earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments (this provision has been referred to by both parties as audit). Respondent indicated that an audit has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an audit. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal's authority, Claimant's request for an audit is granted. Claimant may undertake the audit for the periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018) and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that this award, if an audit be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the audit. This award does not define the scope of the audit as part of the award as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal's authority. Arbitrator's Decision, page 6.

In review of the Arbitrator's decision, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines. It is clear in review of the Arbitrator's decision he was well aware of the limits of his authority and simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an audit. Thus, a non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate an arbitration decision.

Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court's review of the arbitrary-and-capricious standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the law. *Id.*

As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial evidence to support the Arbitrator's Award.

Finally, although the Court has addressed the primary contested issues raised by Defendant Review Journal in its Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, the Court will briefly address the issues raised by the LV Sun.

After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were not additional promotional activities and expenses. The LV Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court Affirms the Arbitrator's ruling.

Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the LV Sun's tortious breach claims. The Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood

that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts vs. torts. Further, the Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA that the tort claims potentially applied. Although it is not set forth in detail how the Arbitrator evaluated the party's unique relationship, it appears he determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue, and therefore, he found that the party's conduct does not qualify for tortious breach. Consequently, the Court cannot find that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the law or the JOA or that the decision was arbitrary and capricious.

Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs, and the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorney's fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his ruling. Accordingly, the Court Affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on costs and fees.

Lastly, the LV Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the Review Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator noted that while the Review Journal has done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an audit, yet he determined that the Review Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

As a result of the foregoing, the Review Journal's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award shall be DENIED. The LV Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part shall be GRANTED in Part and DENIED in Part. The LV Sun's motion is granted as to the request to confirm the Arbitration Award. The LV Sun's motion is denied as to all requests to vacate, modify, or correct the Arbitrator's Award. Lastly, the Review Journal's Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part shall be GRANTED in Part and DENIED in Part. The Review Journal's countermotion is granted as to the request to confirm the Arbitration Award. The Review Journal's countermotion is denied as to the request to vacate the Arbitration Award.

Lastly, in order to alleviate any potential misunderstanding in light of the confusing procedural posture of the pleadings and request for relief in this case, it is the Court's intention to AFFIRM the entire Arbitration Decision as written.

Counsel for Plaintiff shall prepare a detailed Order, Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law, based not only on the foregoing Minute Order, but also on the record on file herein. This is to be submitted to adverse counsel for review and approval and/or submission of a competing Order or objections, prior to submitting to the Court for review and signature.

CLERK'S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Other Business Court Matters**

**COURT MINUTES**

**January 10, 2020**

---

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

---

**January 10, 2020      11:45 AM      Minute Order**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES  
PRESENT:**

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- On January 9, 2020, a stay was entered in this case. Therefore, the Court hereby vacates the pending motions under submission regarding sealing of documents. In the event of the stay being lifted, these matters will renew for consideration and decision.

CLERK S NOTE: This Minute Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Other Business Court Matters

COURT MINUTES

January 29, 2020

A-18-772591-B      Las Vegas Sun Inc, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
News+Media Capital Group LLC, Defendant(s)

**January 29, 2020      9:00 AM      Motion for Leave**

**HEARD BY:** Williams, Timothy C.      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 03H

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:** Peggy Isom

**PARTIES**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Gayan, Michael J	Attorney
	Jones, Jon Randall	Attorney
	Martini, Kristen L.	Attorney
	Smith, Jordan T., ESQ	Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Upon Court's inquiry as to federal action status, Mr. Gayan advised Motions to Dismiss fully briefed, hearings not set, his client moved to stay pending dismissal, conference report submitted, and there is a 2/4/20 hearing before Magistrate on stay issue and the report. Arguments by Mr. Gayan and Mr. Smith regarding the instant Motion. Court stated there appears jurisdiction on the issue. COURT ORDERED, Motion For Leave To File Additional Briefing Requested By Court GRANTED. Colloquy regarding briefing and hearing schedule as to sealing issue and modification of stipulated protective order. There being agreement, COURT FURTHER ORDERED, briefing and hearing as follows: Motion DUE 2/12/20; Opposition DUE 2/26/20; Reply DUE 3/4/20; Hearing SET 3/11/20. Court directed Mr. Gayan to prepare today's order. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, 2/19/20 Status Check matters VACATED.

3/11/20 9:30 AM HEARING ON SEALING AND MODIFICATION ISSUE

CLERK'S NOTE: Subsequent to proceedings, Court hereby clarifies as to the briefing there will be no strict page number limit; parties are to follow customary limit pursuant to the Rules. This Minute

PRINT DATE:      01/30/2020      Page 31 of 32      Minutes Date:      August 22, 2018



Order has been electronically served to the parties through Odyssey eFile.



EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLERK'S OFFICE  
**NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY**  
ON APPEAL TO NEVADA SUPREME COURT

**J. RANDALL JONES, ESQ.**  
**3800 HOWARD HUGHES PKWY, 17<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR**  
**LAS VEGAS, NV 89169**

**DATE: January 30, 2020**  
**CASE: A-18-772591-B**

**RE CASE:** LAS VEGAS SUN, INC. vs. NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP, LLC; LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.

NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED: January 28, 2020

**YOUR APPEAL HAS BEEN SENT TO THE SUPREME COURT.**

PLEASE NOTE: DOCUMENTS **NOT** TRANSMITTED HAVE BEEN MARKED:

- ☒ \$250 – Supreme Court Filing Fee (Make Check Payable to the Supreme Court)\*\*
  - If the \$250 Supreme Court Filing Fee was not submitted along with the original Notice of Appeal, it must be mailed directly to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court Filing Fee will not be forwarded by this office if submitted after the Notice of Appeal has been filed.
- ☐ \$24 – District Court Filing Fee (Make Check Payable to the District Court)\*\*
- ☒ \$500 – Cost Bond on Appeal (Make Check Payable to the District Court)\*\*
  - NRAP 7: Bond For Costs On Appeal in Civil Cases
- ☐ Case Appeal Statement
  - NRAP 3 (a)(1), Form 2
- ☐ Order
- ☐ Notice of Entry of Order

---

NEVADA RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 3 (a) (3) states:

"The district court clerk must file appellant's notice of appeal despite perceived deficiencies in the notice, including the failure to pay the district court or Supreme Court filing fee. **The district court clerk shall apprise appellant of the deficiencies in writing**, and shall transmit the notice of appeal to the Supreme Court in accordance with subdivision (g) of this Rule with a notation to the clerk of the Supreme Court setting forth the deficiencies. Despite any deficiencies in the notice of appeal, the clerk of the Supreme Court shall docket the appeal in accordance with Rule 12."

*Please refer to Rule 3 for an explanation of any possible deficiencies.*

---

*\*\*Per District Court Administrative Order 2012-01, in regards to civil litigants, "...all Orders to Appear in Forma Pauperis expire one year from the date of issuance." You must reapply for in Forma Pauperis status.*

# Certification of Copy

State of Nevada }  
County of Clark } SS:

I, Steven D. Grierson, the Clerk of the Court of the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of the hereinafter stated original document(s):

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S NOTICE OF APPEAL; NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S CASE APPEAL STATEMENT; DISTRICT COURT DOCKET ENTRIES; CIVIL COVER SHEET; FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION AWARD; NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION AWARD; DISTRICT COURT MINUTES; NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC.,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP, LLC; LAS  
VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,

Defendant(s),

Case No: A-18-772591-B

Dept No: XVI


now on file and of record in this office.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto  
Set my hand and Affixed the seal of the  
Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada  
This 30 day of January 2020.

Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court



Amanda Hampton, Deputy Clerk



**NOAS**

E. LEIF REID, Nevada Bar No. 5750  
KRISTEN L. MARTINI, Nevada Bar No. 11272  
NICOLE SCOTT, Nevada Bar No. 13757  
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP  
One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, Nevada 89501-2128  
Tel: 775.823.2900  
Fax: 775.823.2929  
Email: [lreid@lrrc.com](mailto:lreid@lrrc.com)  
[kmartini@lrrc.com](mailto:kmartini@lrrc.com)  
[nscott@lrrc.com](mailto:nscott@lrrc.com)

JAMES J. PISANELLI, Nevada Bar No. 4027  
TODD L. BICE, Nevada Bar No. 4534  
JORDAN T. SMITH, Nevada Bar No. 12097  
PISANELLI BICE PLLC  
400 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
Telephone: 702.214.2100  
Email: [JJP@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JJP@pisanellibice.com)  
[TLB@pisanellibice.com](mailto:TLB@pisanellibice.com)  
[JTS@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JTS@pisanellibice.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
Delaware limited liability company; and LAS  
VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company;

Defendants.

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware corporation,

Counterclaimant,

vs.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

Counter-Defendant.

**CASE NO.: A-18-772591-B**

**DEPT.: 16**

**LAS VEGAS SUN, INC.'S NOTICE OF  
CROSS-APPEAL**

110469516.1

One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, NV 89501-2128

**Lewis Roca**  
ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

1 Please take notice that Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant Las Vegas Sun, Inc., hereby cross-  
2 appeals to the Supreme Court of Nevada from:

3 The Court's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Affirming the Arbitration  
4 Award, filed on January 28, 2020, the Notice of Entry of which was served electronically on  
5 January 28, 2020 (**Exhibit 1**), as well as all orders, rulings, or decisions related thereto that are  
6 made appealable thereby.

7 DATED this 11th day of February, 2020.

8 By: /s/ E. Leif Reid

9 E. LEIF REID, Bar No. 5750

10 KRISTEN L. MARTINI, Bar No. 11272

11 NICOLE SCOTT, Bar No. 13757

12 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP

13 One East Liberty Street, Suite 300

14 Reno, Nevada 89501-2128

15 JAMES J. PISANELLI, Bar No. 4027

16 TODD L. BICE, Bar No. 4534

17 JORDAN T. SMITH, Bar No. 12097

18 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

19 400 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300

20 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 Pursuant to Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of LEWIS  
3 ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP, and that on this date, I caused the foregoing **LAS**  
4 **VEGAS SUN, INC.'S NOTICE OF CROSS-APPEAL** to be served by electronically filing the  
5 foregoing with the Odyssey electronic filing system, which will send notice of electronic filing to  
6 the following:

7 Steve Morris, Esq., SBN 1543  
8 MORRIS LAW GROUP  
9 411 E. Bonneville Ave., Ste. 360  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

J. Randall Jones, Esq., SBN 1927  
Michael J. Gayan, Esq., SBN 11135  
Mona Kaveh, Esq., SBN 11825  
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3880 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

10 Richard J. Stone  
11 David R. Singer  
12 Amy M. Gallegos  
13 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, California 90071

14 DATED this 11th day of February, 2020.

15 /s/ Jessie M. Helm  
16 Employee of Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP

One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, NV 89501-2128

**Lewis Roca**  
ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

**EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>EXHIBIT NO.</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>NO. OF PAGES</b>
1	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, filed on January 28, 2020	11

# **EXHIBIT 1**


**Notice of Entry of Findings of Facts,  
Conclusions of Law, and Order  
Affirming the Arbitration Award**

# **EXHIBIT 1**



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
 Seventeenth Floor  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 (702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
 kjc@kempjones.com

Electronically Filed  
 1/28/2020 4:52 PM  
 Steven D. Grierson  
 CLERK OF THE COURT



J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
 r.jones@kempjones.com  
 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
 m.gayan@kempjones.com  
 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
 m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 rstone@jenner.com  
 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 dsinger@jenner.com  
 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
 agallegos@jenner.com  
 JENNER & BLOCK  
 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**  
**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
 corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
 Delaware limited liability company; and  
 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
 Delaware limited liability company,

Defendants.

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
 Delaware corporation,

Counterclaimant,

v.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
 corporation,

Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
 Dept. No.: 16

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF  
 FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND  
 ORDER AFFIRMING THE  
 ARBITRATION AWARD**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the **FINDINGS OF**  
2 **FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION**  
3 **AWARD** was entered in the above-entitled matter on January 28, 2020, a copy of which is  
4 attached hereto.

5 DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

6 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

7  
8 /s/ Michael Gayan

9 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
10 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
11 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
12 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

14 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
15 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
16 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
17 JENNER & BLOCK  
18 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
19 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054


20 *Attorneys for Defendants*

21 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

22 I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of  
23 the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF**  
24 **LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION AWARD** via the Court's  
25 electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules,  
26 Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

27 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

28 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**  
14  
15 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

16 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,  
17 Plaintiff,  
18 v.  
19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,  
21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,  
24 Counterclaimant,  
25 v.  
26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,  
27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD**

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.’s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.’s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.’s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 “Motions”).

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.’s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the “JOA”).

15 ***The Sun’s Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the “Review-Journal”) in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun’s motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 ***The Arbitration Award***

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 ***The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award***

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 ***The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award***

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial

1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
13 the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
14 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
15 There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
16 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
17 expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las*  
15 *Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious



1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 ***The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,***  
9 ***Modify or Correct the Award, in Part***

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.

29. Lastly, the Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the Review-Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator determined that the Review-Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Arbitration  
14 Award is confirmed in its entirety.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as provided for herein.

21 |||

25 |||

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.

6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams

9 Submitted by:

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11  
12 Madeira Z Vela #13626  
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
*Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

*Steven D. Grierson*

One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, NV 89501-2128

**Lewis Roca**  
ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

1 E. LEIF REID, Nevada Bar No. 5750  
2 KRISTEN L. MARTINI, Nevada Bar No. 11272  
3 NICOLE SCOTT, Nevada Bar No. 13757  
4 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP  
5 One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
6 Reno, NV 89501-2128  
7 Tel: 775.823.2900  
8 Fax: 775.823.2929  
9 Email: [lreid@lrrc.com](mailto:lreid@lrrc.com)  
10 [kmartini@lrrc.com](mailto:kmartini@lrrc.com)  
11 [nscott@lrrc.com](mailto:nscott@lrrc.com)

12 JAMES J. PISANELLI, Nevada Bar No. 4027  
13 TODD L. BICE, Nevada Bar No. 4534  
14 JORDAN T. SMITH, Nevada Bar No. 12097  
15 PISANELLI BICE PLLC  
16 400 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
18 Telephone: 702.214.2100  
19 Email: [JJP@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JJP@pisanellibice.com)  
20 [TLB@pisanellibice.com](mailto:TLB@pisanellibice.com)  
21 [JTS@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JTS@pisanellibice.com)

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant*

23 **DISTRICT COURT**

24 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

25 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
26 corporation,  
27 Plaintiff,

28 vs.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
Delaware limited liability company; and LAS  
VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company;

Defendants.

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware corporation,  
Counterclaimant,

vs.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,  
Counter-Defendant.

**CASE NO.: A-18-772591-B**

**DEPT.: 16**

**JUDGMENT**

110376113.1

FEB 06 2020

1 Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate  
2 or Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part; Defendants News+Media Capital Group  
3 LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award; and  
4 Defendants News+Media Capital Group, LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Conditional  
5 Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate the Award, in Part, came on  
6 for hearing before the Court, the Honorable Timothy C. Williams presiding, and good cause  
7 appearing, **the Court finds as follows:**

8 On January 28, 2020, this Court entered its Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and  
9 Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, which, *inter alia*, confirmed the arbitrator's award of  
10 \$1,662,720 in damages on Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Third Claim for Relief (Breach of  
11 Contract—Editorial Costs: Section 4.2 and Related Provisions), and \$261,459.94 of simple interest  
12 on this damages award through January 28, 2020, against Defendants News+Media Capital Group  
13 LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.

14 On January 28, 2020, this Court entered its Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and  
15 Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, which, *inter alia*, confirmed the arbitrator's award of  
16 \$40,666.38 in fees and costs of arbitration to Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc., against Defendants  
17 News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc.

18 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that judgment, pursuant to NRS  
19 38.243(1), is entered in favor of Las Vegas Sun, Inc., in the amount of \$1,924,179.94, with post-  
20 judgment interest of \$250.54 per day accruing thereon from January 28, 2020, until paid in full.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28





KEMP JONES, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kj@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP JONES, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**

14 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
16 corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
20 Delaware limited liability company; and  
21 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company,

22 Defendants.

23 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
24 Delaware corporation,


25 Counterclaimant,

26 v.

27 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
28 corporation,

Counter-defendant.

Electronically Filed  
2/28/2020 1:40 PM  
Steven D. Grierson  
CLERK OF THE COURT



KEMP JONES, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant News+Media Capital Group LLC and Defendant/Counterclaimant Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc. (collectively, "Review-Journal") hereby appeal to the Supreme Court of Nevada from the following:

1. Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, filed on January 28, 2020 (the "Order"), in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. The Notice of Entry of Order was filed and served on January 28, 2020, and is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.<sup>1</sup>

2. The Judgment, filed on February 18, 2020 (the "Judgment"), in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**, and all orders made appealable thereby. The Notice of Entry of Judgment was filed and served on February 18, 2020, and is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

DATED this 28th day of February, 2020.

KEMP JONES, LLP

*/s/ J. Randall Jones*

J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

*Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

<sup>1</sup> The Review-Journal timely filed its Notice of Appeal from the Order on January 28, 2020. The Judgment was not yet entered at that time, so the Review-Journal is filing this Amended Notice of Appeal to include the Judgment, and all orders made appealable thereby.



KEMP JONES, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com


**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 28th day of February, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC AND LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.'S AMENDED NOTICE OF APPEAL** via the Court's electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules, Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

/s/ Pamela Montgomery

An Employee of Kemp Jones, LLP

# **EXHIBIT 1**



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**  
14  
15 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

16 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD**

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.’s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.’s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.’s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 “Motions”).

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

#### 12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.’s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the “JOA”).

#### 15 ***The Sun’s Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the “Review-Journal”) in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun’s motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.

1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 ***The Arbitration Award***

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 ***The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award***

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 ***The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award***

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial

1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
13 the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
14 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
15 There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
16 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
17 expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las*  
15 *Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious



1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 ***The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,***  
9 ***Modify or Correct the Award, in Part***

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.

**ORDER**

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is DENIED.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm  
18 Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in  
19 Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED  
20 IN PART as provided for herein.

21 |||

25 |||

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.

6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams


9 Submitted by:

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11  
12 Madeira Z Vela #13626  
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
*Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

# **EXHIBIT 2**



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

**DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13  
14 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
15 corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
19 Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
23 Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
27 corporation,

28 Counter-defendant.

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: 16

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF  
FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND  
ORDER AFFIRMING THE  
ARBITRATION AWARD**

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the **FINDINGS OF**  
2 **FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION**  
3 **AWARD** was entered in the above-entitled matter on January 28, 2020, a copy of which is  
4 attached hereto.

5 DATED this 28th day of January, 2020.

6 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

7  
8 /s/ Michael Gayan

9 J. Randall Jones, Esq., (#1927)  
10 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
11 Mona Kaveh, Esq., (#11825)  
12 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

14 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
15 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
16 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
17 JENNER & BLOCK  
18 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
19 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2054


20 *Attorneys for Defendants*

21 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

22 I hereby certify that on the 28th day of January, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of  
23 the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF**  
24 **LAW, AND ORDER AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION AWARD** via the Court's  
25 electronic filing system only, pursuant to the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules,  
26 Administrative Order 14-2, to all parties currently on the electronic service list.

27 /s/ Pamela Montgomery

28 An Employee of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
r.jones@kempjones.com  
2 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
m.gayan@kempjones.com  
3 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
m.kaveh@kempjones.com  
4 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
6 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

7 Richard L. Stone, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
rstone@jenner.com  
8 David R. Singer, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
dsinger@jenner.com  
9 Amy M. Gallegos, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)  
agallegos@jenner.com  
10 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-2054  
Telephone: (213) 239-2203

12 *Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

13 **DISTRICT COURT**  
14  
15 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

16 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company; and  
20 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.

22 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC.,  
23 a Delaware corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

27 Counter-defendant.  
28

Case No.: A-18-772591-B  
Dept. No.: XVI

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINDINGS OF FACTS,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE ARBITRATION  
AWARD**

Hearing Date: October 22, 2019

JAN 03 2020

1 This matter came before the Court on October 22, 2019, at 1:30 P.M., with all parties  
2 appearing by and through their counsel of record, on (a) Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.’s Motion  
3 to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the  
4 Award, in Part, (b) Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review  
5 Journal, Inc.’s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award, and (c) Defendants News+Media  
6 Capital Group LLC’s and Las Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.’s Conditional Countermotion to  
7 Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part (collectively, the  
8 “Motions”).

9 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the  
10 Motions, having heard arguments of counsel, and for good cause appearing, enters the following  
11 findings, conclusions and Order:<sup>1</sup>

### 12 **BACKGROUND**

13 1. On June 10, 2005, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) and Defendant Las  
14 Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.’s predecessor executed a joint operating arrangement (the “JOA”).

#### 15 ***The Sun’s Complaint and the Arbitration***

16 2. On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc. (the “Sun”) filed its Complaint  
17 against Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.  
18 (collectively, the “Review-Journal”) in the above-captioned matter regarding disputes related to  
19 the JOA, and moved this Court to compel arbitration of certain (but not all) claims outlined in  
20 the Complaint.

21 3. This Court granted the Sun’s motion to compel arbitration via an order entered  
22 on November 21, 2018.

23 4. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties engaged in discovery, submitted  
24 written briefs, and presented arguments and evidence before the Arbitrator.

25 5. After a multi-day arbitration hearing, the Arbitrator issued a Final Award of

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Any finding of fact more properly characterized as a conclusion of law shall be deemed so.  
28 Any conclusion of law more properly characterized as a finding of fact shall be deemed so.



1 Arbitrator on July 2, 2019 (the “Award”).

2 ***The Arbitration Award***

3 6. The Award contains the Arbitrator’s rulings on the following claims and requests  
4 for relief: (a) the Sun’s requests for declaratory relief related to interpretation of various JOA  
5 provisions (i.e., Section 4.2, Section 5.1.4, and the audit provision in Appendix D); (b) the  
6 Sun’s breach of contract claims related to those same sections of the JOA; (c) the Sun’s claim  
7 for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing related to those same  
8 sections of the JOA; and (d) both parties’ requests for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs  
9 related to the arbitration proceedings. The full contents of the Award are the subject of various  
10 motions to seal pending before this Court.

11 ***The Parties’ Motions to Confirm/Vacate the Award***

12 7. On September 13, 2019, the Sun filed its Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award,  
13 in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part (the “Sun’s  
14 Motion”).

15 8. On September 18, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its Motion to Vacate  
16 Arbitration Award.

17 9. On September 30, 2019, the Review-Journal filed its opposition to the Sun’s  
18 Motion along with a Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to  
19 Vacate the Award, in Part.

20 10. By October 11, 2019, the parties completed briefing the motions.

21 11. On October 22, 2019, this Court heard arguments on the parties’ motions.

22 12. On December 4, 2019, this Court issued its six-page Minute Order resolving the  
23 parties’ motions, affirming the Award in its entirety, and directing the parties to prepare and  
24 submit this more detailed Order for the Court’s review and signature.

25 **DISCUSSION, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

26 ***The RJ’s Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award***

27 13. The first issue raised by the Review-Journal as the basis to vacate the Award  
28 focused on whether the Arbitrator disregarded the plain language of the JOA by failing to

1 subtract editorial expenses from revenues in order to calculate EBITDA (earnings before  
2 interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization) for the purposes of determining the Sun's share  
3 of profits under the JOA.

4 14. Under Nevada law, "[t]he party seeking to attack the validity of an arbitration  
5 award has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, the statutory or common-  
6 law ground relied upon for challenging the award." *Washoe Cty. Sch. Dist. v. White*, 133 Nev.  
7 301, 303, 396 P.3d 834, 838 (2017) (quoting *Health Plan of Nev., Inc. v. Rainbow Med., LLC*,  
8 120 Nev. 689, 695, 100 P.3d 172, 176 (2004)). There are two common-law grounds recognized  
9 in Nevada under which a court may review private binding arbitration award: (1) whether the  
10 award is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by the agreement; and (2) whether the arbitrator  
11 manifestly disregarded the law." *Id.* at 306. The Nevada Supreme Court explained the  
12 distinction between the two as: "the former standard ensures that the arbitrator does not  
13 disregard the facts or the terms of the arbitration agreement," while "the latter standard ensures  
14 that the arbitrator recognizes applicable law." *Id.*

15 15. Moreover, "[j]udicial inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the-law standard is  
16 extremely limited." *Id.* When a party seeks to vacate an arbitration award based on manifest  
17 disregard of the law, they must show more than a mere objection to the results of the arbitration.  
18 *Id.* Consequently, the Court's focus is not on whether the Arbitrator correctly interpreted the  
19 law, but "whether the arbitrator, knowing the law and recognizing that the law required a  
20 particular result, simply disregarded the law." *Id.*

21 16. In the instant action, the Arbitrator was presented with the JOA's plain language  
22 and determined that under the JOA, editorial expenses should not be included in the EBITDA  
23 calculation. There appears to be a colorable justification for the Arbitrator's findings on this  
24 issue. The Arbitrator concluded:

25 The term "Retention" was very similar to earnings before interest, taxes,  
26 depreciation and amortization (EBITDA). The prior (pre-2005) computation of  
27 "Retention" included Editorial Expenses of the RJ as allowable deductible  
28 expenses. On the other hand, a specific provision of the JOA (4.2), a provision  
which was new to the calculation in the 2005 JOA, specifically indicates that  
the RJ and Sun would each bear their own editorial costs meaning that the RJ  
would not, in keeping the books of the JOA, be permitted to deduct editorial

1 expenses of the RJ in computing EBITDA of the JOA and the subsequent  
2 annual profits payments (if any) to the Sun. The weight of the evidence leads to  
3 the conclusion that the RJ has improperly deducted the RJ editorial expenses  
reducing the EBITDA of the JOA resulting in improperly low annual profits  
payments to the Sun.

4 17. Consequently, the Court finds that the Review-Journal has failed to meet its  
5 burden by clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly disregarded the JOA's  
6 contract provisions as to the deduction of editorial expenses.

7 18. Next, the Arbitrator considered Section 5.1.4 of the JOA to determine the impact  
8 of promotional activities and expense on the EBITDA. The Arbitrator concluded that under his  
9 interpretation of Section 5.1.4 there was evidence of impermissible deductions. The Arbitrator  
10 noted:

11 The weight of the evidence indicated that the RJ charged all promotional  
12 expenses to the JOA (both expenses that would be allowed as promotion of both  
13 the RJ and Sun in equal prominence and additional promotional activities  
14 expenses of the RJ only) resulting in lower EBITDA and payments to the Sun.  
15 There was not enough evidence presented in this matter to make a definitive  
16 damages calculation of wrongfully charged additional promotional activities  
17 expenses by the RJ. A crucial element of a breach of contract action is the proof  
of damages beyond speculation. Fortunately, the "audit" awarded in this matter  
could determine the damages (and additional profits payments due), if any, from  
the RJ's charging of all (both proper and additional) promotional expenses to  
the JOA EBITDA. It is the finding of this tribunal that additional promotional  
activities may not be included in the expenses charged to the JOA EBITDA.

18 19. In light of the Arbitrator's analysis and reliance of Section 5.1.4 of the JOA, the  
19 Court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the Arbitrator manifestly  
20 disregarded the JOA's contract provisions as to promotional activities and expenses.

21 20. Next, the Court reviews the Review-Journal's contentions that the Arbitrator  
22 exceeded his authority when he issued a two-page supplementary non-binding interpretation  
23 regarding the ordered audit.

24 21. In determining the grounds for invalidating an arbitration award based on the  
25 assertion that an Arbitrator exceeded his authority, in *Washoe*, the Nevada Supreme Court  
26 noted:

27 "The Nevada Arbitration Act provides specific grounds for invalidating an  
28 arbitration award. NRS 38.241(1)(d) dictates that a court shall vacate an  
arbitration award if the arbitrator exceeded his powers." *Health Plan of Nev.*,

1 *Inc.*, 120 Nev. at 697, 100 P.3d at 178 (internal citation omitted). In particular,  
2 “[a]rbitrators exceed their powers when they address issues or make awards  
3 outside the scope of the governing contract.” *Id.* “However, allegations that an  
4 arbitrator misinterpreted the agreement or made factual or legal errors do not  
5 support vacating an award as being in excess of the arbitrator’s powers.” *Id.*  
6 Moreover, “[a]rbitrators do not exceed their powers if their interpretation of an  
7 agreement, even if erroneous, is rationally grounded in the agreement.” *Id.* at  
8 698, 100 P.3d at 178. As such, “[t]he question is whether the arbitrator had the  
9 authority under the agreement to decide an issue, not whether the issue was  
10 correctly decided.” *Id.* Therefore, “[a]n award should be enforced so long as the  
11 arbitrator is arguably construing or applying the contract” and “there is a  
12 colorable justification for the outcome.” *Id.* Nonetheless, “[t]he deference  
13 accorded an arbitrator . . . is not limitless; he is not free to contradict the express  
14 language of the contract.” *Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 1285 v. City of Las*  
15 *Vegas*, 107 Nev. 906, 910, 823 P.2d 877, 879 (1991).

16 *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 304.

17 22. It must be pointed out that Appendix D to the JOA provides that the Sun has a  
18 right to a yearly audit as the Arbitrator noted:

19 Appendix D to the JOA allowing for the Claimant to “...appoint an certified  
20 public accounting firm or law firm as Sun’s representative to examine and audit  
21 the books and records of the Review-Journal and the other publications whose  
22 earnings are included in EBITDA for the purposes of verifying the  
23 determinations of the changes to the Annual Profit Payments...” (this provision  
24 has been referred to by both parties as “audit”). Respondent indicated that an  
25 “audit” has never been refused however the conduct of Respondent certainly has  
26 done just about everything possible to blunt, avoid, deter and postpone an  
27 “audit”. In accordance with the scope of this tribunal’s authority, Claimant’s  
28 request for an “audit” is granted. Claimant may undertake the “audit” for the  
periods covered by this award (December 15, 2015 through March 31, 2018)  
and forward per the declaratory relief granted. Respondent had requested that  
this award, if an “audit” be directed, limit the scope and/or party to conduct the  
“audit”. This award does not define the scope of the “audit” as part of the award  
as such specificity may be beyond the scope of the tribunal’s authority.

29 23. In review of the Award, the Arbitrator ordered an audit but recognized there is  
30 no provision for the creation of audit rules or guidelines in the JOA. Additionally, the Arbitrator  
31 noted that neither party requested any of audit rules or guidelines provided in the Award. It is  
32 clear in review of the Award that the Arbitrator was well aware of the limits of his authority and  
33 simply suggested a non-binding legal evaluation and recommendation as to the guideline for an  
34 audit. Thus, the Arbitrator’s non-binding legal opinion is not a sufficient basis to vacate the  
35 Award.

36 24. Next, the Court has to consider whether the Arbitrator issued an Award that was  
37 arbitrary and capricious. Under Nevada law, a court’s review of the arbitrary-and-capricious

1 standard is limited to whether the arbitrator's findings are supported by substantial evidence in  
2 the record. *Washoe*, 133 Nev. at 308. Further, "The arbitrary-and-capricious standard does not  
3 permit a reviewing court to vacate an arbitrator's award based on a misinterpretation of the  
4 law." *Id.*

5 25. As this Court has already found, the Arbitrator based his rulings on his  
6 interpretations of the JOA. Under the facts of this case and the JOA, there is substantial  
7 evidence to support the Award.

8 ***The Sun's Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively,***  
9 ***Modify or Correct the Award, in Part***

10 26. After reviewing Section 5.1.4, the Arbitrator determined that House Ads were  
11 not additional promotional activities and expenses. The Sun argues that the Arbitrator's ruling is  
12 arbitrary and capricious and a manifest disregard of the law. Nonetheless, the Court finds that  
13 the Arbitrator did consider section 5.1.4 in relation to House Ads, and as a result the Court  
14 affirms the Award on this issue.

15 27. Additionally, after weighing the evidence in this matter, the Arbitrator denied the  
16 Sun's claims for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The  
17 Court again reiterates that its inquiry under the manifest-disregard-of-the law standard is  
18 extremely limited. Consequently, the Court will not reassess and weigh the evidence that the  
19 Arbitrator relied on to make his decision. It is clear to the Court that the Arbitrator understood  
20 that there is a distinction between contract and tort claims, and the unique nature of the  
21 covenant of good faith and fair dealing as it relates to contracts versus torts. Further, the  
22 Arbitrator noted the sections of the JOA to which the tort claims potentially applied. Although it  
23 is not set forth in detail, the Arbitrator evaluated the parties' unique relationship, and he  
24 determined there was insufficient evidence of intentional conduct on this issue. Therefore, he  
25 found that the Review-Journal's conduct "does not qualify for tortious breach." Consequently,  
26 with respect to the Sun's claim for tortious breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
27 dealing, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did not manifestly disregard the law or the JOA, and  
28 the decision was not arbitrary and capricious.

28. Also, the Arbitrator noted that both parties requested attorneys' fees, costs and the cost of arbitration; but, found that no provision in the JOA addressed awarding attorneys' fees and costs in connection with this matter. Rather, the Arbitrator interpreted Appendix D of the JOA and found that Appendix D addressed the award of arbitration fees and costs. As a consequence, the Arbitrator awarded only fees and costs of the arbitration. Thus, the Court finds that the Arbitrator did consider the entire JOA and more specifically Appendix D to support his ruling. Accordingly, the Court affirms the Arbitrator's ruling on attorneys' fees and costs.

29. Lastly, the Sun argues that the Arbitrator failed to enter a ruling on whether the Review-Journal breached the JOA audit provision. However, the Arbitrator determined that the Review-Journal has never refused to conduct an audit. Therefore, the Arbitrator simply ordered that an audit be conducted and this decision is affirmed.

**ORDER**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Arbitration Award is confirmed in its entirety.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Review-Journal's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate or, Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part the Sun's Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as provided for herein.

///


///



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants News+Media Capital Group LLC and Las  
2 Vegas-Review Journal, Inc.'s Conditional Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in  
3 Part, and to Vacate the Award, in Part is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as  
4 provided for herein.

5 Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2020.

6  
7   
8 The Honorable Timothy C. Williams

9 Submitted by:

10 KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

11  
12 Madeira Z Vela #13626  
13 J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
14 Michael J. Gayan, Esq. (#11135)  
15 Mona Kaveh, Esq. (#11825)  
16 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
*Counsel for Defendants/Counterclaimant*

# **EXHIBIT 3**



*Steven D. Grierson*

One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, NV 89501-2128

**Lewis Roca**  
ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

1 E. LEIF REID, Nevada Bar No. 5750  
2 KRISTEN L. MARTINI, Nevada Bar No. 11272  
3 NICOLE SCOTT, Nevada Bar No. 13757  
4 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP  
5 One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
6 Reno, NV 89501-2128  
7 Tel: 775.823.2900  
8 Fax: 775.823.2929  
9 Email: [lreid@lrrc.com](mailto:lreid@lrrc.com)  
10 [kmartini@lrrc.com](mailto:kmartini@lrrc.com)  
11 [nscott@lrrc.com](mailto:nscott@lrrc.com)

12 JAMES J. PISANELLI, Nevada Bar No. 4027  
13 TODD L. BICE, Nevada Bar No. 4534  
14 JORDAN T. SMITH, Nevada Bar No. 12097  
15 PISANELLI BICE PLLC  
16 400 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
18 Telephone: 702.214.2100  
19 Email: [JJP@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JJP@pisanellibice.com)  
20 [TLB@pisanellibice.com](mailto:TLB@pisanellibice.com)  
21 [JTS@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JTS@pisanellibice.com)

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant*

23 **DISTRICT COURT**

24 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

25 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
26 corporation,  
27 Plaintiff,

28 vs.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
Delaware limited liability company; and LAS  
VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company;

Defendants.

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware corporation,  
Counterclaimant,

vs.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,  
Counter-Defendant.

**CASE NO.: A-18-772591-B**

**DEPT.: 16**

**JUDGMENT**

110376113.1

FEB 06 2020

1 Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate  
2 or Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part; Defendants News+Media Capital Group  
3 LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award; and  
4 Defendants News+Media Capital Group, LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Conditional  
5 Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate the Award, in Part, came on  
6 for hearing before the Court, the Honorable Timothy C. Williams presiding, and good cause  
7 appearing, **the Court finds as follows:**

8 On January 28, 2020, this Court entered its Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and  
9 Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, which, *inter alia*, confirmed the arbitrator's award of  
10 \$1,662,720 in damages on Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Third Claim for Relief (Breach of  
11 Contract—Editorial Costs: Section 4.2 and Related Provisions), and \$261,459.94 of simple interest  
12 on this damages award through January 28, 2020, against Defendants News+Media Capital Group  
13 LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.

14 On January 28, 2020, this Court entered its Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and  
15 Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, which, *inter alia*, confirmed the arbitrator's award of  
16 \$40,666.38 in fees and costs of arbitration to Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc., against Defendants  
17 News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc.

18 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that judgment, pursuant to NRS  
19 38.243(1), is entered in favor of Las Vegas Sun, Inc., in the amount of \$1,924,179.94, with post-  
20 judgment interest of \$250.54 per day accruing thereon from January 28, 2020, until paid in full.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///


27 ///

28

110376113.1



# **EXHIBIT 4**



1 NJUD  
2 E. LEIF REID, ESQ., BAR NO. 5750  
3 KRISTEN L. MARTINI, ESQ., BAR NO. 11272  
4 NICOLE SCOTT, ESQ., BAR NO. 13757  
5 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP  
6 One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
7 Reno, Nevada 89501-2128  
8 Tel: 775.823.2900  
9 Fax: 775.823.2929  
10 Email: lreid@lrrc.com  
11 kmartini@lrrc.com  
12 nscott@lrrc.com

13 JAMES J. PISANELLI, ESQ., BAR NO. 4027  
14 TODD L. BICE, ESQ., BAR NO. 4534  
15 JORDAN T. SMITH, ESQ., BAR NO. 12097  
16 PISANELLI BICE PLLC  
17 400 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
18 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
19 Tel: 702.214.2100  
20 Email: JJP@pisanellibice.com  
21 TLB@pisanellibice.com  
22 JTS@pisanellibice.com

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

24 DISTRICT COURT  
25 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

26 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
27 corporation,

28 Plaintiff,

v.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
Delaware limited liability company; and LAS  
VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company;

Defendants.

CASE NO.: A-18-772591-B

DEPT.: 16

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

///

110467268.1

One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, NV 89501-2128

**Lewis Roca**  
ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a “Judgment” was entered on February 18, 2020. A copy of  
2 the Judgment is attached hereto.

3 DATED this 18th day of February, 2020.

4 By: /s/ Kristen L. Martini

5 E. LEIF REID, Bar No. 5750

6 KRISTEN L. MARTINI, Bar No. 11272

7 NICOLE SCOTT, Bar No. 13757

8 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP

9 One East Liberty Street, Suite 300

10 Reno, Nevada 89501-2128

11 JAMES J. PISANELLI, Bar No. 4027

12 TODD L. BICE, Bar No. 4534

13 JORDAN T. SMITH, Bar No. 12097

14 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

15 400 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300

16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, NV 89501-2128

**Lewis Roca**  
ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP, and that on this date, I caused the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT** to be served by electronically filing the foregoing with the Odyssey electronic filing system, which will send notice of electronic filing to the following:

Richard J. Stone	J. Randall Jones, Esq., SBN 1927
David R. Singer	Michael J. Gayan, Esq., SBN 11135
Amy M. Gallegos	Monah Kaveh, Esq., SBN 11825
JENNER & BLOCK LLP	KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP
633 West 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600	3880 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17 <sup>th</sup> Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071	Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

DATED this 18th day of February, 2020.

/s/ Autumn D. McDannald  
Employee of Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP



*Steven D. Grierson*

One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
Reno, NV 89501-2128

**Lewis Roca**  
ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

1 E. LEIF REID, Nevada Bar No. 5750  
2 KRISTEN L. MARTINI, Nevada Bar No. 11272  
3 NICOLE SCOTT, Nevada Bar No. 13757  
4 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP  
5 One East Liberty Street, Suite 300  
6 Reno, NV 89501-2128  
7 Tel: 775.823.2900  
8 Fax: 775.823.2929  
9 Email: [lreid@lrrc.com](mailto:lreid@lrrc.com)  
10 [kmartini@lrrc.com](mailto:kmartini@lrrc.com)  
11 [nscott@lrrc.com](mailto:nscott@lrrc.com)

12 JAMES J. PISANELLI, Nevada Bar No. 4027  
13 TODD L. BICE, Nevada Bar No. 4534  
14 JORDAN T. SMITH, Nevada Bar No. 12097  
15 PISANELLI BICE PLLC  
16 400 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
18 Telephone: 702.214.2100  
19 Email: [JJP@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JJP@pisanellibice.com)  
20 [TLB@pisanellibice.com](mailto:TLB@pisanellibice.com)  
21 [JTS@pisanellibice.com](mailto:JTS@pisanellibice.com)

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant*

23 **DISTRICT COURT**

24 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

25 LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
26 corporation,  
27 Plaintiff,

28 vs.

NEWS+MEDIA CAPITAL GROUP LLC, a  
Delaware limited liability company; and LAS  
VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware limited liability company;

Defendants.

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, INC., a  
Delaware corporation,  
Counterclaimant,

vs.

LAS VEGAS SUN, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,  
Counter-Defendant.

**CASE NO.: A-18-772591-B**

**DEPT.: 16**

**JUDGMENT**

110376113.1

FEB 06 2020



1 Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Motion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part, and to Vacate  
2 or Alternatively, Modify or Correct the Award, in Part; Defendants News+Media Capital Group  
3 LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Motion to Vacate the Arbitration Award; and  
4 Defendants News+Media Capital Group, LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.'s Conditional  
5 Countermotion to Confirm Arbitration Award, in Part and to Vacate the Award, in Part, came on  
6 for hearing before the Court, the Honorable Timothy C. Williams presiding, and good cause  
7 appearing, **the Court finds as follows:**

8 On January 28, 2020, this Court entered its Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and  
9 Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, which, *inter alia*, confirmed the arbitrator's award of  
10 \$1,662,720 in damages on Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc.'s Third Claim for Relief (Breach of  
11 Contract—Editorial Costs: Section 4.2 and Related Provisions), and \$261,459.94 of simple interest  
12 on this damages award through January 28, 2020, against Defendants News+Media Capital Group  
13 LLC's and Las Vegas Review-Journal, Inc.

14 On January 28, 2020, this Court entered its Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and  
15 Order Affirming the Arbitration Award, which, *inter alia*, confirmed the arbitrator's award of  
16 \$40,666.38 in fees and costs of arbitration to Plaintiff Las Vegas Sun, Inc., against Defendants  
17 News+Media Capital Group LLC's and Las Vegas Review Journal, Inc.

18 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that judgment, pursuant to NRS  
19 38.243(1), is entered in favor of Las Vegas Sun, Inc., in the amount of \$1,924,179.94, with post-  
20 judgment interest of \$250.54 per day accruing thereon from January 28, 2020, until paid in full.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

