

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

INDICATE FULL CAPTION:

SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL
UNION, et al.,
Appellants,

vs.

DANA GENTRY, AN INDIVIDUAL, AND
ROBERT CLARKE, AN INDIVIDUAL,
Respondents.

No. 81166

Electronically Filed
Jun 01 2020 05:26 p.m.
Elizabeth N. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

DOCKETING

CIVIL APPEALS

GENERAL INFORMATION

Appellants must complete this docketing statement in compliance with NRAP 14(a). The purpose of the docketing statement is to assist the Supreme Court in screening jurisdiction, identifying issues on appeal, assessing presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, scheduling cases for oral argument and settlement conferences, classifying cases for expedited treatment and assignment to the Court of Appeals, and compiling statistical information.

WARNING

This statement must be completed fully, accurately and on time. NRAP 14(c). The Supreme Court may impose sanctions on counsel or appellant if it appears that the information provided is incomplete or inaccurate. *Id.* Failure to fill out the statement completely or to file it in a timely manner constitutes grounds for the imposition of sanctions, including a fine and/or dismissal of the appeal.

A complete list of the documents that must be attached appears as Question 27 on this docketing statement. Failure to attach all required documents will result in the delay of your appeal and may result in the imposition of sanctions.

This court has noted that when attorneys do not take seriously their obligations under NRAP 14 to complete the docketing statement properly and conscientiously, they waste the valuable judicial resources of this court, making the imposition of sanctions appropriate. See KDI Sylvan Pools v. Workman, 107 Nev. 340, 344, 810 P.2d 1217, 1220 (1991). Please use tab dividers to separate any attached documents.

1. Judicial District Eighth Department 26
County Clark Judge Honorable Judge Gloria J. Sturman
District Ct. Case No. A-17-764942-C

2. Attorney filing this docketing statement:

Attorney Evan L. James Telephone (702) 255-1718
Firm Christensen James & Martin
Address 7440 W Sahara Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89117

Client(s) Service Employees International Union and Nevada Service Employees Union

If this is a joint statement by multiple appellants, add the names and addresses of other counsel and the names of their clients on an additional sheet accompanied by a certification that they concur in the filing of this statement.

3. Attorney(s) representing respondents(s):

Attorney Michael J. McAvoyamaya Telephone (702) 299-5083
Firm N/A
Address 4539 Paseo Del Ray
Las Vegas, NV 89121

Client(s) Dana Gentry and Robert Clarke

Attorney _____ Telephone _____
Firm _____
Address _____

Client(s) _____

(List additional counsel on separate sheet if necessary)

4. Nature of disposition below (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment after bench trial | <input type="checkbox"/> Dismissal: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment after jury verdict | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of jurisdiction |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summary judgment | <input type="checkbox"/> Failure to state a claim |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Default judgment | <input type="checkbox"/> Failure to prosecute |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of injunction | <input type="checkbox"/> Divorce Decree: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of declaratory relief | <input type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Modification |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review of agency determination | <input type="checkbox"/> Other disposition (specify): _____ |

5. Does this appeal raise issues concerning any of the following?

- ☐ Child Custody
- ☐ Venue
- ☐ Termination of parental rights

6. Pending and prior proceedings in this court. List the case name and docket number of all appeals or original proceedings presently or previously pending before this court which are related to this appeal:

Clarke v. Service Employees International Union, et al., Case No. 80520 (pending appeal from the grant of summary judgment in favor of defendants)

7. Pending and prior proceedings in other courts. List the case name, number and court of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts which are related to this appeal (e.g., bankruptcy, consolidated or bifurcated proceedings) and their dates of disposition:

None.

8. Nature of the action. Briefly describe the nature of the action and the result below:

Plaintiffs Dana Gentry and Robert Clarke were formerly employed by Nevada Service Employees Union (“Local 1107”). Following their terminations, they filed a wrongful termination action against Local 1107, Service Employees International Union (“SEIU”), and other individual defendants, alleging causes of action for breach of contract and related torts. The district court granted defendants summary judgment, and that order was entered on January 3, 2020. Clarke has filed an appeal from that order. See Supreme Court Case No. 80520. That appeal remains pending.

9. Issues on appeal. State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal (attach separate sheets as necessary):

SEIU and Local 1107 appeal from the district court’s order denying their motions for attorneys’ fees, entered on April 10, 2020. SEIU and Local 1107 sought attorneys’ fees pursuant to Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 68 because they made a joint settlement offer to Gentry and Clarke pursuant to Rule 68, but Gentry and Clarke did not recover a more favorable judgment. The district court denied the motions for attorneys’ fees, finding that it was not grossly unreasonable for Gentry and Clarke to reject the joint settlement offer. SEIU and Local 1107 contend that the plaintiffs’ rejection of the settlement offer was grossly unreasonable, and that the district court’s contrary conclusion was erroneous.

10. Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues. If you are aware of any proceedings presently pending before this court which raises the same or similar issues raised in this appeal, list the case name and docket numbers and identify the same or similar issue raised:

None.

11. Constitutional issues. If this appeal challenges the constitutionality of a statute, and the state, any state agency, or any officer or employee thereof is not a party to this appeal, have you notified the clerk of this court and the attorney general in accordance with NRAP 44 and NRS 30.130?

☒ N/A

☐ Yes

☐ No

If not, explain:

12. Other issues. Does this appeal involve any of the following issues?

☐ Reversal of well-settled Nevada precedent (identify the case(s))

☐ An issue arising under the United States and/or Nevada Constitutions

☐ A substantial issue of first impression

☐ An issue of public policy

☐ An issue where en banc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of this court's decisions

☐ A ballot question

If so, explain:

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

This appeal is presumptively assigned to the Court of Appeals pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 17(b)(7), because it concerns an appeal from a post-judgment order in a civil case, and is not a type of case described by Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 17(a) (1)–(12). However, the Supreme Court should retain this appeal because it arises from the same case that is currently before the Supreme Court in Case No. 80520, and there is an overlap of issues presented in both appeals. In particular, whether plaintiffs were grossly unreasonable in rejecting SEIU’s and Local 1107’s joint settlement offer requires an evaluation of the merits of their defenses, including their defense that plaintiffs’ claims were Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, 29 U.S.C. § 401, et seq. (“LMRDA”). Whether Plaintiffs’ claims were preempted is the principal issue on appeal in Case No. 80520.

14. Trial. If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last? N/A

Was it a bench or jury trial? _____

15. Judicial Disqualification. Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from participation in this appeal? If so, which Justice?

No.

TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

16. Date of entry of written judgment or order appealed from Apr 10, 2020

If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review:

17. Date written notice of entry of judgment or order was served Apr 14, 2020

Was service by:

☐ Delivery

☒ Mail/electronic/fax

18. If the time for filing the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion (NRCP 50(b), 52(b), or 59)

(a) Specify the type of motion, the date and method of service of the motion, and the date of filing.

☐ NRCP 50(b) Date of filing _____

☐ NRCP 52(b) Date of filing _____

☐ NRCP 59 Date of filing _____

NOTE: Motions made pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration may toll the time for filing a notice of appeal. See AA Primo Builders v. Washington, 126 Nev. ____, 245 P.3d 1190 (2010).

(b) Date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion _____

(c) Date written notice of entry of order resolving tolling motion was served _____

Was service by:

☐ Delivery

☐ Mail

19. Date notice of appeal filed May 11, 2020

If more than one party has appealed from the judgment or order, list the date each notice of appeal was filed and identify by name the party filing the notice of appeal:

SEIU and Local 1107 filed a joint notice of appeal.

20. Specify statute or rule governing the time limit for filing the notice of appeal, e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other

Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(1)

SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY

21. Specify the statute or other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review the judgment or order appealed from:

(a)

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> NRAP 3A(b)(1) | <input type="checkbox"/> NRS 38.205 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NRAP 3A(b)(2) | <input type="checkbox"/> NRS 233B.150 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NRAP 3A(b)(3) | <input type="checkbox"/> NRS 703.376 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) <u>NRAP 3A(b)(8)</u> | |
-

(b) Explain how each authority provides a basis for appeal from the judgment or order:

A post-judgment order regarding attorneys' fees is appealable under Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 3A(b)(8), which permits appeal from "[a] special order entered after final judgment, excluding an order granting a motion to set aside a default judgment under NRCP 60(b)(1) when the motion was filed and served within 60 days after entry of the default judgment." See *Campos-Garcia v. Johnson*, 130 Nev. 610, 612 (2014) ("Thus, we have recognized that a post-judgment order awarding attorney fees and costs is appealable, even though not termed a 'judgment' or incorporated into the final judgment" (citing NRAP 3A(b)(8))).

22. List all parties involved in the action or consolidated actions in the district court:

(a) Parties:

Robert Clarke, plaintiff; Dana Gentry, plaintiff; SEIU, defendant; Luisa Blue, defendant; Martin Manteca, defendant; Mary Kay Henry, defendant; Sharon Kisling, defendant; SEIU Local 1107, defendant.

(b) If all parties in the district court are not parties to this appeal, explain in detail why those parties are not involved in this appeal, *e.g.*, formally dismissed, not served, or other:

Individual defendants Luisa Blue, Martin Manteca, Mary Kay Henry, and Sharon Kisling are not involved in this appeal because only SEIU and Local 1107, not the individual defendants, made the joint settlement offer pursuant to Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 68.

23. Give a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate claims, counterclaims, cross-claims, or third-party claims and the date of formal disposition of each claim.

Dana Gentry: breach of contract, wrongful termination, defamation

Robert Clarke: breach of contract, wrongful termination

24. Did the judgment or order appealed from adjudicate ALL the claims alleged below and the rights and liabilities of ALL the parties to the action or consolidated actions below?

☐ Yes

☒ No

25. If you answered "No" to question 24, complete the following:

(a) Specify the claims remaining pending below:

No claims remain pending in the district court, because summary judgment was granted in favor of all defendants on all claims. That summary judgment order is the subject of Supreme Court Case No. 80520.

(b) Specify the parties remaining below:

None.

(c) Did the district court certify the judgment or order appealed from as a final judgment pursuant to NRCP 54(b)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

(d) Did the district court make an express determination, pursuant to NRCP 54(b), that there is no just reason for delay and an express direction for the entry of judgment?

☐ Yes

☒ No

26. If you answered "No" to any part of question 25, explain the basis for seeking appellate review (e.g., order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)):

The order denying SEIU and Local 1107 attorneys' fees is appealable under NRAP 3A(b)(8).

27. Attach file-stamped copies of the following documents:

- The latest-filed complaint, counterclaims, cross-claims, and third-party claims
- Any tolling motion(s) and order(s) resolving tolling motion(s)
- Orders of NRCP 41(a) dismissals formally resolving each claim, counterclaims, cross-claims and/or third-party claims asserted in the action or consolidated action below, even if not at issue on appeal
- Any other order challenged on appeal
- Notices of entry for each attached order

VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read this docketing statement, that the information provided in this docketing statement is true and complete to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I have attached all required documents to this docketing statement.

Nevada Service Employees Union
Name of appellant

Evan L. James
Name of counsel of record

Jun 1, 2020
Date

Evan L. James
Signature of counsel of record

Nevada, Clark County
State and county where signed

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 1st day of June, 2020, I served a copy of this completed docketing statement upon all counsel of record:

- ☐ By personally serving it upon him/her; or
- ☐ By mailing it by first class mail with sufficient postage prepaid to the following address(es): (NOTE: If all names and addresses cannot fit below, please list names below and attach a separate sheet with the addresses.)

Michael J. McAvoyamya, Esq.
4539 Paseo Del Rey Dr.
Las Vegas, NV 89121

Glenn Rothner (Pro hac vice)
Jonathan Cohen (10551)
Maria Keegan Myers (12049)
510 South Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101-3115

Dated this 1st day of June, 2020

Evan L. James
Signature

Addition to Paragraph 2 – Attorney Filing Document Statement – and Certification of Concurrence

Attorneys: Jonathan Cohen, Maria Myers, Glenn Rothner

Firm: Rothner Segal Greenstone

Address: 510 South Marengo Avenue, Pasadena, California 91101-3115

Client: Service Employees International Union


CERTIFICATION OF CONCURRENCE

I, Evan L. James, hereby certify that attorneys Jonathan Cohen, Maria Myers and Glenn Rothner concur in the filing of the Docketing Statement.

Dated: June 1, 2020



Evan L James



MICHAEL J. MCAVOYAMAYA, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No.: 014082
4539 Paseo Del Ray
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121
Telephone: (702) 685-0879
Mmcavoyamayalaw@gmail.com
Attorney for Plaintiffs

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * * *

DANA GENTRY, an individual; and
ROBERT CLARKE, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL
UNION, a nonprofit cooperative corporation;
LUISA BLUE, in her official capacity as Trustee
of Local 1107; MARTIN MANTECA, in his
official capacity as Deputy Trustee of Local
1107; MARY K. HENRY, in her official
capacity as Union President; SHARON
KISLING, individually; CLARK COUNTY
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION dba
NEVADA SERVICE EMPLOYEES UNION
aka SEIU 1107, a non-profit cooperative
corporation; DOES 1-20; and ROE
CORPORATIONS 1-20, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: A-17-764942-C

DEPT. NO.: 26

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)

COME NOW, Plaintiffs DANA GENTRY and ROBERT CLARKE, by and through
their attorney of record MICHAEL J. MCAVOYAMAYA, ESQ., and hereby complain and
allege as follows:

I. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Dana Gentry is and was at all times relevant herein a resident of Clark
County, Nevada.

2. Plaintiff Robert Clarke is and was at all times relevant herein a resident of
Clark County, Nevada.

1 3. Defendant Service Employees International Union (hereinafter referred to as
2 “SEIU”) is and was at all times relevant herein a nonprofit corporation with headquarters in
3 Washington D.C. with sufficient contacts with Local 1107 in Clark County, Nevada to confer
4 personal jurisdiction.

5 4. Defendant Luisa Blue (hereinafter the “Trustee”), at all times relevant herein
6 was present in Clark County, Nevada to confer personal jurisdiction.

7 5. Defendant Martin Manteca (hereinafter the “Deputy Trustee”) at all times
8 relevant herein was present in Clark County, Nevada to confer personal jurisdiction.

9 6. Defendant Mary Kay Henry (hereinafter “President Henry”) on information
10 and belief is a resident of Washington D.C., and at all times relevant herein had sufficient
11 contact with Local 1107 in Clark County, Nevada to confer personal jurisdiction.

12 7. Defendant Clark County Public Employees Association, dba Nevada Service
13 Employees Union aka SEIU 1107 (hereinafter “Local 1107”), is and was at all times relevant
14 herein a domestic non-profit cooperative corporation, having its main and principal office in
15 Clark County, Nevada.

16 8. Sharon Kisling, at all times relevant herein was present in Clark County,
17 Nevada to confer personal jurisdiction.

18 9. The true names of DOES 1 through 20, their citizenship and capacities,
19 whether individual, corporate, associate, partnership or otherwise, are unknown to Plaintiffs
20 who therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and
21 believe, and therefore allege, that each of the Defendants, designated as DOES 1 through 20,
22 are or may be legally responsible for the events referred to in this action, and caused damages
23 to the Plaintiffs, as herein alleged, and Plaintiffs will ask leave of this Court to amend the
24 Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of such Defendants, when the same have
25 been ascertained, and to join them in this action, together with the proper charges and
26 allegations.
27
28

1 10. That the true names and capacities of Defendants named herein as DOE
2 AGENCIES 1 through 20 and ROE CORPORATIONS 1 through 20, inclusive, are unknown
3 to the Plaintiffs, who therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs are
4 informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the Defendants designated herein as a
5 DOE AGENCIES and/or ROE CORPORATION Defendant is responsible for the events and
6 happenings referred to and proximately caused damages to the Plaintiffs as alleged herein.
7 Plaintiffs will ask leave of the Court to amend the Complaint to insert the true names and
8 capacities of DOE AGENCIES 1 through 20 and ROE CORPORATIONS 1 through 20,
9 inclusive, when the same have been ascertained, and to join such Defendants in this action.
10

11 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants and claims as set forth
13 herein pursuant to NRS 14.065, that such jurisdiction is not inconsistent with the Nevada
14 Constitution or the United States Constitution.

15 12. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant NRS 13.010 *et seq.* because, among
16 other reasons, Local 1107 operates its principal place of business in Clark County, Nevada.
17 Furthermore, this action arises out of the Contract between the Plaintiffs, Local 1107 and
18 SEIU, which was entered into and performed in Clark County, Nevada.

19 **III. ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS**

20 13. On April 18, 2016, Local 1107 entered into a contract of employment with
21 Plaintiff Dana Gentry (hereinafter the “Gentry Contract”). The Gentry Contract was executed
22 by then Local 1107 President Cherie Mancini and Plaintiff Dana Gentry. The position held by
23 Plaintiff Gentry was Communications Director.

24 14. On August 23, 2016, Local 1107 extended an offer of employment to Plaintiff
25 Robert Clarke. Plaintiff Robert Clarke accepted the offer of employment with Local 1107 on
26 or about September 6, 2016 (hereinafter the “Clarke Contract”). The Clarke Contract was
27
28

1 executed by then Local 1107 President Cherie Mancini and Plaintiff Robert Clarke. The
2 position held by Plaintiff Clarke was Director of Finance and Human Resources.

3 15. Both the Gentry Contract and the Clarke Contract contain the same termination
4 clause, which states: "Termination of this employment agreement may be initiated by the
5 SEIU Nevada President *for cause* and is appealable to the local's Executive Board, which
6 shall conduct a full and fair hearing before reaching a final determination regarding your
7 employment status."

9 16. On April 28, 2017, Defendant SEIU President Mary Kay Henry placed Local
10 1107 under trusteeship and appointed Defendants Luisa Blue and Martin Manteca as
11 Trustee and Deputy Trustee, respectively.

12 17. On April 28, 2017, the managing staff of Local 1107 were told to stay home.

13 18. On May 4, 2017, Defendant Deputy Trustee Martin Manteca delivered a letter
14 to Plaintiff Robert Clarke informing Clarke that his employment with Local 1107 was
15 terminated effective immediately.

16 19. On May 4, 2017, Defendant Deputy Trustee Martin Manteca delivered a letter
17 to Plaintiff Dana Gentry informing Gentry that her employment with Local 1107 was
18 terminated effective immediately.

20 20. Both the letter to Clarke and the letter to Gentry contained the same language
21 regarding their termination: "the Trustees will fill management and other positions at the
22 Local with individuals they are confident can and will carry out the Local's new program and
23 policies. In the interim, the Trustees will largely be managing the Local themselves with input
24 from member leaders. For these reasons, the Trustees have decided to terminate your
25 employment with Local 1107, effective immediately."

27 21. Plaintiff Robert Clarke could not appeal the termination decision to Local
28 1107's Executive Board because the Board had been disbanded by SEIU, and Deputy Trustee

1 Manteca and Trustee Luisa Blue have exclusive control over Local 1107 since the Trusteeship
2 was imposed.

3 22. Plaintiff Dana Gentry could not appeal the termination decision to Local
4 1107's Executive Board because the Board had been disbanded by SEIU, and Deputy Trustee
5 Manteca and Trustee Luisa Blue have exclusive control over Local 1107 since the Trusteeship
6 was imposed.
7

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
9 **Breach of Contract – Dana Gentry**

10 23. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
11 though fully set forth herein.

12 24. That Local 1107 entered into a valid and binding Employment Contract with
13 Dana Gentry.

14 25. That said Employment Contract contained a clause specifying that termination
15 of Plaintiff's employment could only be initiated for cause.

16 26. That Deputy Trustee Manteca and Trustee Blue are the interim managers of
17 Local 1107 while it is under Trusteeship, and the Executive Board is disbanded, leaving
18 Plaintiff no avenue to appeal the termination decision.
19

20 27. That Deputy Trustee Manteca and Trustee Blue as the managers of Local 1107
21 breached the Employment Contract by terminating Plaintiff Dana Gentry without cause.

22 28. That Plaintiff Dana Gentry has sustained damages in the result of said breach
23 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
24 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
25

26 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
27 **Breach of Contract – Robert Clarke**

28 29. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
though fully set forth herein.

1 30. That Local 1107 entered into a valid and binding Employment Contract with
2 Robert Clarke.

3 31. That said Employment Contract contained a clause specifying that termination
4 of Plaintiff's employment could only be initiated for cause.

5 32. That Deputy Trustee Manteca and Trustee Blue are the interim managers of
6 Local 1107 while it is under Trusteeship, and the Executive Board is disbanded, leaving
7 Plaintiff no avenue to appeal the termination decision.

8 33. That Deputy Trustee Manteca and Trustee Blue as the managers of Local 1107
9 breached the Employment Contract by terminating Plaintiff Robert Clarke without cause.

10 34. That Plaintiff Robert Clarke has sustained damages in the result of said breach
11 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
12 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
13
14

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
16 **Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing – Contractual Breach**
17 **Dana Gentry**

18 35. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
19 though fully set forth herein.

20 36. Plaintiff Gentry entered into a valid and binding Employment Contract with
21 Local 1107.

22 37. That Defendant Local 1107, their parent union SEIU, and the Deputy Trustee
23 Manteca and Trustee Blue owed a duty of good faith to Plaintiff Gentry to perform under the
24 employment agreement, which could only be terminated for cause.

25 38. That Defendants breached their duty of good faith by terminating the
26 Employment Contract between Local 1107 and Plaintiff Gentry in order to fill Gentry's
27 position with individuals the Trustees would choose, which was unfaithful to the purpose of
28 the Gentry Contract that specified employment could only be terminated for cause.

39. That Plaintiff Gentry had the justified expectation that her employment could only be terminated for cause.

40. That Defendants' breach denied Plaintiff Gentry her justified expectation that she could only be terminated for cause.

41. That Plaintiff Dana Gentry has sustained damages as a result of said breach in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing – Contractual Breach
Robert Clarke

42. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as though fully set forth herein.

43. Plaintiff Clarke entered into a valid and binding Employment Contract with Local 1107.

44. That Defendant Local 1107, their parent union SEIU, and the Deputy Trustee Manteca and Trustee Blue owed a duty of good faith to Plaintiff Clarke to perform under the employment agreement, which could only be terminated for cause.

45. That Defendants breached their duty of good faith by terminating the Employment Contract between Local 1107 and Plaintiff Clarke in order to fill Clarke's position with individuals the Trustees would choose, which was unfaithful to the purpose of the Clarke Contract that specified employment could only be terminated for cause.

46. That Plaintiff Clarke had the justified expectation that his employment could only be terminated for cause.

47. That Defendants' breach denied Plaintiff Clarke his justified expectation that he could only be terminated for cause.

1 48. That Plaintiff Robert Clarke has sustained damages as a the result of said
2 breach in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing
3 this action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

4
5 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
6 **Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing – Tortious Breach**
7 **Dana Gentry**

8 49. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
9 though fully set forth herein.

10 50. That Plaintiff Gentry entered into an employment contract with Local 1107.

11 51. That Defendant Local 1107, their affiliate parent union SEIU, and the Deputy
12 Trustee Manteca and Trustee Blue owed a duty of good faith to Plaintiff Gentry to perform
13 under the employment agreement, which could only be terminated for cause.

14 52. That a special element of reliance or fiduciary duty existed between Plaintiff
15 Gentry and Defendants Local 1107, SEIU, SEIU President Henry, Deputy Trustee Manteca
16 and Trustee Blue where Defendants were in a superior or entrusted position as Plaintiff's
17 employer.

18 53. That Defendants collectively breached that duty by terminating the
19 employment agreement between Local 1107 and Plaintiff Gentry in order to fill Gentry's
20 position with individuals the Trustees would choose, which was unfaithful to the "for cause"
21 purpose of the Gentry Contract and amounts to engaging in misconduct under the Gentry
22 Contract.

23
24 54. That Plaintiff Dana Gentry has sustained damages in the result of said breach
25 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
26 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

27 //

28 //

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing – Tortious Breach
Robert Clarke

55. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as though fully set forth herein.

56. That Plaintiff Clarke entered into an employment contract with Local 1107.

57. That Defendant Local 1107, their parent union SEIU, and the Deputy Trustee Manteca and Trustee Blue owed a duty of good faith to Plaintiff Clarke to perform under the employment agreement, which could only be terminated for cause.

58. That a special element of reliance or fiduciary duty existed between Plaintiff Clarke and Defendants Local 1107, SEIU, SEIU President Henry, Deputy Trustee Manteca and Trustee Blue where Defendants were in a superior or entrusted position as Plaintiff's employer.

59. That Defendants collectively breached that duty by terminating the employment agreement between Local 1107 and Plaintiff Clarke in order to fill Clarke's position with individuals the Trustees would choose, which was unfaithful to the "for cause" purpose of the Clarke Contract and amounts to engaging in misconduct under the Clarke Contract.

60. That Plaintiff Robert Clarke has sustained damages in the result of said breach in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Intentional Interference with Contractual Relations – All Plaintiffs against
Defendants SEIU, Henry, Blue and Manteca

61. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as though fully set forth herein.

1 62. That there exist two valid contracts between Plaintiff Gentry and Local 1107
2 and Plaintiff Clarke and Local 1107 containing the for cause termination provision.

3 63. That Defendant Manteca, Defendant Blue, and Defendant Henry are third
4 parties who took control of Local 1107 and knew of the existence of these contracts.

5 64. That Defendants Manteca, Blue and Henry committed intentional acts in the
6 form of terminating the for cause contracts between Plaintiffs Clarke and Gentry and Local
7 1107.
8

9 65. That terminating the Plaintiffs' for cause contracts caused an actual disruption
10 of Plaintiffs' valid employment contracts with Local 1107.

11 66. That Plaintiff Robert Clarke has sustained damages in the result of said breach
12 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
13 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
14

15 67. That Plaintiff Dana Gentry has sustained damages in the result of said breach
16 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
17 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

18 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
19 **Wrongful Termination – Breach of Continued Employment Contract**
20 **Dana Gentry**

21 68. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
22 though fully set forth herein.

23 69. That Defendant Local 1107 and Plaintiff Gentry entered into an employment
24 contract on April 18, 2016.

25 70. That Defendant Local 1107 expressly agreed with Plaintiff that employment
26 was to be for an indefinite term and could be terminated only for cause.

27 71. That Defendant Local 1107 and Defendants Manteca and Blue breached the
28 Employment Contract by terminating Plaintiff Gentry without cause.

1 72. That Plaintiff Dana Gentry has sustained damages in the result of said breach
2 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
3 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

4 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
5 **Wrongful Termination – Breach of Continued Employment Contract**
6 **Robert Clarke**

7 73. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
8 though fully set forth herein.

9 74. That Defendant Local 1107 and Plaintiff Clarke entered into an employment
10 contract on September 6, 2016.

11 75. That Defendant Local 1107 expressly agreed with Plaintiff that employment
12 was to be for an indefinite term and could be terminated only for cause.

13 76. That Defendant Local 1107 and Defendants Manteca and Blue breached the
14 Employment Contract by terminating Plaintiff without cause.

15 77. That Plaintiff Robert Clarke has sustained damages in the result of said breach
16 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
17 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

18 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
19 **Wrongful Termination – Bad Faith Discharge**
20 **Dana Gentry**

21 78. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
22 though fully set forth herein.

23 79. That Defendant SEIU 1107 and Plaintiff Gentry entered into an employment
24 contract on April 18, 2016.

25 80. That Plaintiff established contractual rights of continued employment and
26 developed a relationship of trust, reliance and dependency with Defendant Local 1107 by
27 performing her employment duties for Local 1107 through April 2017.
28

1 81. That Defendant Local 1107 and Defendants Manteca, Blue and Henry, acting
2 in bad faith, breached the employment contract by discharging Plaintiff Gentry without cause.

3 82. That Plaintiff Dana Gentry has sustained damages in the result of said breach
4 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
5 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
6

7 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
8 **Wrongful Termination – Bad Faith Discharge**
9 **Robert Clarke**

10 83. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
11 though fully set forth herein.

12 84. That Defendant Local 1107 and Plaintiff Clarke entered into an employment
13 contract on September 6, 2016.

14 85. That Plaintiff established contractual rights of continued employment and
15 developed a relationship of trust, reliance and dependency with Defendant Local 1107 by
16 performing his employment duties for Local 1107 through April 2017.

17 86. That Defendant Local 1107 and Defendants Manteca, Blue and Henry, acting
18 in bad faith, breached the employment contract by discharging Plaintiff Clarke without cause.

19 87. That Plaintiff Robert Clarke has sustained damages in the result of said breach
20 in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this
21 action, including Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
22

23 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
24 **Tortious Discharge - Dana Gentry**

25 88. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
26 though fully set forth herein.

27 89. That Defendant Local 1107, at the direction of and through the actions of
28 Defendants SEIU, Manteca, Blue and Henry improperly dismissed Plaintiff Gentry in order to

1 fill Plaintiff's position with individuals who would carry out SEIU's new program and
2 policies at Local 1107, which violates public policy upholding "for cause termination"
3 provisions in employment contracts.

4 90. That as a result, Plaintiff has sustained damages in an amount in excess of
5 \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this action, including Plaintiffs'
6 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
7

8 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
9 **Tortious Discharge - Robert Clarke**

10 91. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
11 though fully set forth herein.

12 92. That Defendant Local 1107, at the direction of and through the actions of
13 Defendants SEIU, Manteca, Blue and Henry improperly dismissed Plaintiff Clarke in order to
14 fill Plaintiff's position with individuals who would carry out SEIU's new program and
15 policies at Local 1107, which violates public policy upholding "for cause termination"
16 provisions in employment contracts.
17

18 93. That as a result, Plaintiff has sustained damages in an amount in excess of
19 \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this action, including Plaintiffs'
20 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

21 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
22 **Negligence**

23 94. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
24 though fully set forth herein.

25 95. That Defendant Local 1107 owed a duty of care to Plaintiffs as Plaintiffs'
26 employer to ensure that Plaintiffs would only be terminated for cause.
27
28

1 96. That Defendants Manteca and Blue owed a duty of care to Plaintiffs as the
2 acting managers of Local 1107, which employed Plaintiffs, to ensure that Plaintiffs would
3 only be terminated for cause.

4 97. That Defendants Local 1107, Manteca and Blue breached that duty by
5 terminating Plaintiffs without cause.

6 98. That Defendants Manteca and Blue further breached the duty of care by failing
7 to inspect the Plaintiffs' contracts for employment before terminating Plaintiffs.

8 99. That Defendants' breach of the duty of care caused Plaintiffs to be terminated
9 without cause, in violation of their employment contracts.

10 100. That as a result of said breach, Plaintiffs have sustained damages in an amount
11 in excess of \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this action, including
12 Plaintiffs' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

13
14
15 **FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
16 **Defamation – Dana Gentry Against Sharon Kisling and SEIU Local 1107**

17 101. Plaintiffs restate and reallege all preceding and subsequent allegations as
18 though fully set forth herein.

19 102. That Defendant Sharon Kisling made a false a defamatory statement alleging
20 that Plaintiff Dana Gentry was drinking during performance of her employment and using the
21 union's credit card for personal expenses without authorization.

22 103. That an unprivileged publication of this statement was made to third persons
23 when Defendant Kisling sent a memo containing the unfounded allegations to the Local 1107
24 Executive Board.

25 104. That the statement included an allegation that Plaintiff Gentry committed a
26 crime, to wit: Plaintiff was stealing money from her employer for personal use constituting
27 defamation per se.
28

1 105. That the statement also included an allegation that affected Plaintiff Gentry's
2 business reputation, to wit: that Plaintiff Gentry was drinking alcohol while working for Local
3 1107 constituting defamation per se.

4 106. That Plaintiff Gentry requested that Kisling retract the defamatory statement
5 and she refused.

6 107. That Plaintiff Gentry subsequently request that the Local 1107 Executive
7 Board conduct an investigation and direct Ms. Kisling, the Vice President of Local 1107, to
8 retract the knowingly false defamatory statement.

9 108. That Plaintiff Gentry informed numerous officials from SEIU International,
10 Local 1107's parent organization, of the defamatory statements made against her by Local
11 1107's Vice President, Sharon Kisling.

12 109. That Defendants knew the statements were false.

13 110. That Defendants were at least negligent in making, and refusing to retract the
14 statements because Defendants knew that the statement was false and were published without
15 regard to the damages it caused Plaintiff Gentry in her employment with the Local Union.

16 111. That Plaintiff Gentry was subsequently terminated by Defendants without
17 Defendants retracting the defamatory statements.

18 112. That Plaintiff Gentry has sustained actual or presumed damages as a result of
19 the statement because it damaged her reputation as an employee.

20 113. That Plaintiff Gentry has sustained damages in an amount in excess of
21 \$15,000.00, and the costs and expenses associated in filing this action, including Plaintiffs'
22 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

23 **IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for Judgment in their favor as follows:

- 25 1. Damages in excess of \$15,000.00 for each Plaintiff;

1 2. Compensatory and consequential damages resulting from the injuries caused to
2 Plaintiffs by the breach of the employment contracts with Local 1107;

3 3. The reasonable attorney's fees and costs to bring this suit and post-judgment
4 interest;

5 4. Punitive damages for Defendants intentional and malicious conduct and as
6 allowed by law;

7 5. Such other and further relief as this court deems proper.

8 Dated this 25th day of March, 2019.

9 /s/ Michael J. Mcavaoyamaya

10 _____
MICHAEL J. MCAVOYAMAYA, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No.: 14082


4539 Paseo Del Ray

Las Vegas, Nevada 89121

Telephone: (702) 685-0879

Mmcavoyamayalaw@gmail.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs



ORDR
CHRISTENSEN JAMES & MARTIN
EVAN L. JAMES, ESQ. (7760)
7440 W. Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
Telephone: (702) 255-1718
Facsimile: (702) 255-0871
Email: elj@cjmlv.com,
Attorneys for Local 1107, Luisa Blue and Martin Manteca

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DANA GENTRY, an individual; and
ROBERT CLARKE, an individual,

CASE NO.: A-17-764942-C

Plaintiffs,

DEPT. No. XXVI

vs.

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR
ATTORNEY FEES**

SERVICE EMPLOYEES
INTERNATIONAL UNION, a nonprofit
cooperative corporation; LUISA BLUE, in
her official capacity as Trustee of Local
1107; MARTIN MANTECA, in his
official capacity as Deputy Trustee of
Local 1107; MARY K. HENRY, in her
official capacity as Union President;
SHARON KISLING, individually;
CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC
EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION UNION
aka SEIU 1107, a non-profit cooperative
corporation; DOES 1-20; and ROE
CORPORATIONS 1-20, inclusive,

Defendants.


Defendants' Motions for Attorney Fees (collectively "Motion") having been
briefed and argued, the Court hereby enters the following findings and order.

The Court finds that the Offer of Judgment was properly apportioned in
accordance with NRCP 68(b) and that the Offer of Judgment is in compliance with the
provisions of NRCP 68.. The Court further finds that the Offer of Judgment was
reasonable in amount given that the claims were disputed legally and factually. The Court
further finds that the Offer of Judgment was reasonable in amount given the value offered
in comparison to the damages claimed. The Court further finds that the Plaintiffs hand

1 ample time to evaluate the merits of the respective positions, making the Offer of
2 Judgment's timing reasonable.

3 However, the Court finds that it was not grossly unreasonable for the Plaintiffs to
4 reject the Offer of Judgment because the Offer of Judgment required a global resolution
5 of all claims against all Defendants. Because the Offer of Judgment required a global
6 resolution, it is not clear to the Court how the Plaintiffs could have properly analyzed the
7 Offer of Judgment. The Court therefore denies the Motion and makes no finding on the
8 reasonableness of the fees incurred.

9 DATED this 9th day of April 2020.

10 
11 _____
Judge Gloria J. Sturman

12 Submitted By

13 CHRISTENSEN JAMES & MARTIN

14 By: /s/ Evan L. James

15 Evan L. James, Esq. (7760)

16 7440 W. Sahara Avenue

17 Las Vegas, NV 89117

18 Telephone: (702) 255-1718

19 Fax: (702) 255-0871

Attorneys for Local 1107, Luisa

Blue and Martin Manteca

20 Approved as to Form and Content

21 Rothner, Segall & Greenstone

22 By: /s/ Jonathan Cohen

23 Jonathan Cohen, Esq. (10551)

24 510 S. Marengo Ave.

25 Pasadena, CA 91101

26 Telephone: (626) 796-7555

27 Fax: (626) 577-0124

Attorneys for Service Employees International Union

and Mary Kay Henry

No Response Received


Michael J. Mcavoyamaya, Esq. (14082)

4539 Paseo Del Ray

Las Vegas, NV 89121

Telephone: (702) 299-5083

Attorney for Plaintiffs



NEOJ
CHRISTENSEN JAMES & MARTIN
EVAN L. JAMES, ESQ. (7760)
7440 W. Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
Telephone: (702) 255-1718
Facsimile: (702) 255-0871
Email: elj@cjmlv.com,
Attorneys for Local 1107, Luisa Blue and Martin Manteca

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DANA GENTRY, an individual; and
ROBERT CLARKE, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CASE NO.: A-17-764942-C

DEPT. No. XXVI

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

SERVICE EMPLOYEES
INTERNATIONAL UNION, a nonprofit
cooperative corporation; LUISA BLUE, in
her official capacity as Trustee of Local
1107; MARTIN MANTECA, in his
official capacity as Deputy Trustee of
Local 1107; MARY K. HENRY, in her
official capacity as Union President;
SHARON KISLING, individually;
CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC
EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION UNION
aka SEIU 1107, a non-profit cooperative
corporation; DOES 1-20; and ROE
CORPORATIONS 1-20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Please take notice that the attached order deny attorney fees was entered on April
10, 2020.

DATED April 14, 2020.

CHRISTENSEN JAMES & MARTIN

By: /s/ Evan L. James
Evan L. James, Esq. (7760)
*Attorneys for Local 1107, Luisa Blue
and Martin Manteca*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am an employee of Christensen James & Martin and caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served on April 14, 2020 upon the following:

- Michael Macavoyamaya: mmcavoyamayalaw@gmail.com
- Jonathan Cohen: jcohen@rsglabor.com
- Glenn Rothner: grothner@rsglabor.com
- Maria Myers: mmyers@rsglabor.com
- Evan L. James: elj@cjmlv.com

CHRISTENSEN JAMES & MARTIN

By: /s/ Natalie Saville
Natalie Saville



ORDR
CHRISTENSEN JAMES & MARTIN
EVAN L. JAMES, ESQ. (7760)
7440 W. Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
Telephone: (702) 255-1718
Facsimile: (702) 255-0871
Email: elj@cjmlv.com,
Attorneys for Local 1107, Luisa Blue and Martin Manteca

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DANA GENTRY, an individual; and
ROBERT CLARKE, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CASE NO.: A-17-764942-C

DEPT. No. XXVI

SERVICE EMPLOYEES
INTERNATIONAL UNION, a nonprofit
cooperative corporation; LUISA BLUE, in
her official capacity as Trustee of Local
1107; MARTIN MANTECA, in his
official capacity as Deputy Trustee of
Local 1107; MARY K. HENRY, in her
official capacity as Union President;
SHARON KISLING, individually;
CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC
EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION UNION
aka SEIU 1107, a non-profit cooperative
corporation; DOES 1-20; and ROE
CORPORATIONS 1-20, inclusive,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR
ATTORNEY FEES**


Defendants' Motions for Attorney Fees (collectively "Motion") having been
briefed and argued, the Court hereby enters the following findings and order.

The Court finds that the Offer of Judgment was properly apportioned in
accordance with NRCP 68(b) and that the Offer of Judgment is in compliance with the
provisions of NRCP 68.. The Court further finds that the Offer of Judgment was
reasonable in amount given that the claims were disputed legally and factually. The Court
further finds that the Offer of Judgment was reasonable in amount given the value offered
in comparison to the damages claimed. The Court further finds that the Plaintiffs hand

1 ample time to evaluate the merits of the respective positions, making the Offer of
2 Judgment's timing reasonable.

3 However, the Court finds that it was not grossly unreasonable for the Plaintiffs to
4 reject the Offer of Judgment because the Offer of Judgment required a global resolution
5 of all claims against all Defendants. Because the Offer of Judgment required a global
6 resolution, it is not clear to the Court how the Plaintiffs could have properly analyzed the
7 Offer of Judgment. The Court therefore denies the Motion and makes no finding on the
8 reasonableness of the fees incurred.

9 DATED this 9th day of April 2020.

10 
11 _____
Judge Gloria J. Sturman

12 Submitted By

13 CHRISTENSEN JAMES & MARTIN

14 By: /s/ Evan L. James

15 Evan L. James, Esq. (7760)

16 7440 W. Sahara Avenue

17 Las Vegas, NV 89117

18 Telephone: (702) 255-1718

19 Fax: (702) 255-0871

Attorneys for Local 1107, Luisa

Blue and Martin Manteca

20 Approved as to Form and Content

21 Rothner, Segall & Greenstone

22 By: /s/ Jonathan Cohen

23 Jonathan Cohen, Esq. (10551)

24 510 S. Marengo Ave.

25 Pasadena, CA 91101

26 Telephone: (626) 796-7555

27 Fax: (626) 577-0124

Attorneys for Service Employees International Union

and Mary Kay Henry

No Response Received

Michael J. Mcavoyamaya, Esq. (14082)

4539 Paseo Del Ray

Las Vegas, NV 89121

Telephone: (702) 299-5083

Attorney for Plaintiffs