#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FLOR MORENCY; KEYSHA NEWELL; BONNIE YBARRA; AAA SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION, INC.; SKLAR WILLIAMS PLLC; ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN GROUP, LLC,

Appellants,

VS.

STATE OF NEVADA ex rel. the DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; JHONE EBERT, in her official capacity as executive head of the Department of Education; the DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION; JAMES DEVOLLD, in his official capacity as a member of the Nevada Tax Commission; SHARON RIGBY, in her official capacity as a member of the Nevada Tax Commission: GEORGE KELESIS, in his official capacity as a member of the Nevada Tax Commission; ANN BERSI, in her official capacity as a member of the Nevada Tax Commission; RANDY BROWN, in his official capacity as a member of the Nevada Tax Commission; FRANCINE LIPMAN, in her official, in her official capacity as a member of the Nevada Tax Commission: ANTHONY WREN, in his official capacity as a member of the Nevada Tax Commission; MELANIE YOUNG, in her official capacity as the Executive Director and Chief Administrative Officer of the Department of Taxation,

Respondents,

and

Electronically Filed May 19 2021 09:45 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Supreme Court No. 81281

On Appeal
District Court for
Clark County,
Case No.: A-19-800267-C
Honorable Rob Bare

EXECUTIVE RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

# THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent-Intervenors.

#### **RULE 26.1 Disclosure**

Undersigned counsel of record certifies that each Executive Defendant has been named in their official governmental capacity, such that no further disclosure is required for purposes of evaluating possible disqualification or recusal.

AARON D. FORD Attorney General CRAIG A. NEWBY Deputy Solicitor General Nevada Bar No. 8591 555 E. Washington Ave., Suite 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

T: (702) 486-3420

E: <u>CNewby@ag.nv.gov</u>

Attorney for Respondent State of Nevada

Pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 31(e), the Executive Respondents submit the following response to Appellants' May 14, 2021 Notice of Supplemental Authorities.

## I. Legislature v. Settelmeyer, 137 Nev. Adv. Op. 21 (May 13, 2021).

This Court does not need explanation of last week's decision, which addressed the applicability of the Supermajority Provision to elimination of sunset provisions and the automatic recalculation of the MBT rate. Neither bill addressed by this Court in *Settelmeyer* pertained to the freeze (rather than perpetual increase) of tax expenditures for private school vouchers.

Instead, Appellants in this case challenge the Legislature's redistribution of public revenue, from future tax expenditures for private school tax credits to general state funds, contending that it violates the Supermajority Provision. "From a taxpayer's perspective, they pay the same amount as a result of the MBT, no matter its relative distribution to the Program versus other tax-funded programs." Executive Respondents' Brief at 18. The *Settelmeyer* decision did not determine whether Nevada statutory tax expenditures redistribute tax revenue for private use, or merely reallocate tax revenue between different public uses. If it is the latter, the Supermajority Provision is inapplicable because freezing those expenditures neither increases the public's aggregate tax burden nor increases the state's tax revenue.

That issue remains open for further consideration by this Court in this case (should it determine this case is justiciable) or a future case.

# II. Senate Bill No. 367 (2021 Legislature)

///

First, the Executive Respondents submit that Appellants' submission of an unpassed bill violates NRAP 31(e) because it is not authority of any kind for the Nevada Supreme Court. Indeed, Senate Bill No. 367 will never become Nevada it failed statute because to pass out of committee. See https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021/Bill/8042/Overview (last accessed May 17, 2021).

Second, even if Senate Bill No. 367 could become statute (it cannot), it is not clear that it would be pertinent to this pending case because the bill contains multiple provisions, one of which reduces the attendance threshold at which nonprofit organization events are required to pay the live entertainment tax. *See* <a href="https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021/Bill/8042/Text">https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021/Bill/8042/Text</a> (last accessed May 17, 2021) at pp. 2-3. Appellants' supplement, without further fact ///

discovery, cannot determinatively answer why the bill was marked as requiring compliance with the Supermajority Provision because the unpassed bill has multiple provisions.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 19th day of May, 2021.

AARON D. FORD Attorney General

By: /s/ Craig A. Newby

CRAIG A. NEWBY Deputy Solicitor General Nevada Bar No. 8591

555 N. Washington, Ste. 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Tel: (702) 486-3420

Email: <a href="mailto:cnewby@ag.nv.gov">cnewby@ag.nv.gov</a>

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I am an employee of the Office of the Attorney General and that on this 19th day of May, 2021, I served a copy of the foregoing **EXECUTIVE RESPONDENTS RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY**, by electronic filing to:

### JOSHUA A. HOUSE, ESQ.

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE 901 N. Glebe Rd., Suite 900 Arlington, VA 22203 jhouse@ij.org

## ROBERT GALL, ESQ.

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE 816 Congress Ave., Suite 960 Austin, TX 78701 bgall@ij.org

## MATTHEW T. DUSHOFF, ESQ.

Saltzman Mugan Dushoff 1835 Village Center Cir. Las Vegas, NV 89134 mdushoff@nvbusinesslaw.com

Attorneys for Appellants

#### **KEVIN C. POWERS**

General Counsel Nevada Bar No. 6781 LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU, LEGAL DIVISION 401 S. Carson St. Carson City, NV 89701 kpowers@lcb.state.nv.us

Attorneys for Respondent Legislature of the State of Nevada\_

#### /s/ Kristalei Wolfe

Kristalei Wolfe, Employee of the Office of the Attorney General