## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MM DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, INC., D/B/A PLANET 13, a Nevada Corporation,

Appellant,

vs.

TRYKE COMPANIES SO NV, LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company,

Respondent.

Supreme Court Case No: 81938

Electronically Filed May 24 2021 01:44 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

### RESPONDENT TRYKE COMPANIES SO NV, LLC'S APPENDIX TO ANSWERING BRIEF

## **VOLUME I OF I**

H1 LAW GROUP Eric D. Hone (NV Bar No. 8499) Joel Z. Schwarz (NV Bar No. 9181) Leslie A. S. Godfrey (NV Bar No. 10229) 701 North Green Valley Parkway, Suite 200 Henderson, NV 89074 Tel: 702-608-3720 Fax: 702-703-1063

CONANT LAW FIRM, PLC Paul Conant (AZ Bar No. 012667) (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) 2398 East Camelback Road, Suite 925 Phoenix, AZ 85016 Tel: 602-508-9010 Fax: 602-508-9015

Attorneys for Respondent Tryke Companies SO NV, LLC

## INDEX TO RESPONDENT TRYKE COMPANIES SO NV, LLC'S APPENDIX TO ANSWERING BRIEF

	VOL.	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PAGE</u> <u>NOS.</u>
A.	I.	Reply in Support of Motion for Preliminary Injunction. <sup>1</sup>	Sept. 1, 2020	622-647
B.	I.	Minute Order	Oct. 23, 2020	648-649

Dated this 24<sup>th</sup> day of May 2021.

H1 LAW GROUP

Eric D. Hone (NV Bar No. 8499) Joel Z. Schwarz (NV Bar No. 9181) Leslie A. S. Godfrey (NV Bar No. 10229) 701 North Green Valley Parkway, Suite 200 Henderson, NV 89074 Tel: (702) 608-3720 Fax: (702) 608-3759

CONANT LAW FIRM Paul A. Conant (AZ Bar No. 012667) (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) 2398 East Camelback, Suite 925 Phoenix, AZ 85016

Attorneys for Respondent Tryke Companies SO NV, LLC

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Concurrent with its Answering Brief and Appendix, Respondent Tryke has submitted to the Supreme Court Clerk for filing a Motion to File Unredacted Answering Brief and Unredacted Pages in Appendix Under Seal.

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of May 2021, I submitted the foregoing RESPONDENT TRYKE COMPANIES SO NV, LLC'S APPENDIX TO ANSWERING BRIEF for filing and service via the Court's eFlex electronic filing system.

errew

An employee of H1 LAW GROUP

# **Tryke Companies SO NV, LLC's Reply in Support of Motion for Preliminary Injunction**

# **APPENDIX 622-647**

# UNREDACTED VERSION FILED UNDER SEAL

### DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Other Civil Matters		COURT MINUTES	October 23, 2020			
A-19-804883-C	Tryke Companies SO NV, LLC, Plaintiff(s) vs. MM Development Company, Inc., Defendant(s)					
October 23, 2020	3:00 AM	Motion For Reconsideration				
HEARD BY: Crock	ett, Jim	COURTROOM:	Phoenix Building 11th Floor 116			
COURT CLERK: Rem Lord						

### JOURNAL ENTRIES

- MM Development Company, Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction or, in the Alternative, Motion to Amend Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) or, in the Alternative, Motion for Clarification

This Chambers matter is being decided based upon the status of the record.

Defendant MM Development fails to present newly-discovered evidence or an intervening change in the law to warrant reconsideration or amendment of the Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. The arguments made by Defendant MM are the same arguments made at the time of the hearing that resulted in issuance of the Preliminary Injunction. Putting aside the inadmissible nature of the hearsay statements in the declaration of Security Lieutenant Giannaris, Giannaris states he has worked at MM Development's Planet 13 facility since October of 2018, handling and interacting with rideshare drivers and he attests to the fact that he was an intermediary between Planet 13 and rideshare drivers with regard to making payments to rideshare drivers who brought their passengers to Planet 13. As such, Mr. Ginnaris's information was readily available to Planet 13 at the time of the original Motion for Preliminary Injunction. The arguments about Tryke's delay in pursuing injunctive relief were already addressed in the context of the Covid 19 restrictions. The Exhibit C excerpts from Kickback are all dated after the injunctive relief was granted and simply reflect that drivers are complaining that they are no longer getting paid for diverting passengers like they were before: 9/14/20 9:23 PM Mike No more money pay outs anymore only to cabs something about being sued. [sic] Finally, the court has already thoroughly considered the matter of Plaintiff's likelihood of success so this, too is nothing new to warrant reconsideration or amendment of the injunctive relief granted. The Motion is DENIED. Plaintiff to submit the appropriate order PRINT DATE: 10/23/2020 October 23, 2020 Page 1 of 2 Minutes Date:

within fourteen days per EDCR 7.21. COURT ORDERED. status check SET for the filing of the Order.

#### 12/3/20 STATUS CHECK: FILING OF ORDER (CHAMBERS)

CLERK'S NOTE: This Minute Order was electronically served to all registered parties for Odyssey File & Serve. /rl 10/23/2020

PRINT DATE: 10/23/2020

**APPENDIX 649**