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

MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ,

Appellant,

VS.

LILIANA C. GONZALEZ, N/K/A LILIANA C. GARCIA,

Respondent.

Electronically Filed
Dec 08 2020 12:03 p.m.
Supreme Court No. Eligabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

#### APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME I

#### AARON D GRIGSBY GRIGSBY LAW GROUP

A Professional Corporation Nevada Bar No. 9043 2880 W. Sahara Ave. Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Phone: (702) 202-5235 aaron@grigsbylawgroup.com

Counsel for Appellant

BYRON MILLS MILLS & ANDERSON LAW GROUP

Nevada Bar No. 6745 703 S. Eighth St. Las Vegas, NV 89101 Phone: (702) 386-0030 attorneys@millsnv.com Counsel for Respondent

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned does hereby certify that on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2020, a copy of the foregoing Appellant's Appendix I was served as follows:

#### BY ELECTRONIC FILING TO

Byron L. Mills, Esq. Mills & Anderson 703 S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 attorneys@millsnv.com

> /s/Aaron Grigsby \_\_\_\_\_ Employee of The Grigsby Law Group

# **ORIGINAL**

1	I Code: DECD FILED			
2				
-	Address: 2767 LA CANADA ST. Jul 30 13 36 44 177			
3	T.1. 1 (700) 444 0007			
4	Telephone: (702) 444-0987  Husband's name: MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ			
5	The state of the s			
-6	Address: 2767 LA CANADA ST.  LAS VEGAS, NV 89109			
•	Telephone: (702) 444-0987			
7	In Proper Person			
8				
9	IN THE JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA			
10	IN AND FORCLARK COUNTY			
11	In the Metter of the Merrian			
12	In the Matter of the Marriage ) Case #: D-07-376585-Z ————————————————————————————————————			
13	LILIANA C. GONZALEZ			
14	(Wife's name)			
	)			
15	and )			
16	MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ			
17	(Husband's name) ) 5			
18	Joint Fetidoners )			
19	DECREE OF DIVORCE			
20	DECREE OF DIVORCE			
	The above entitled cause, having been submitted to this Court for decision pursuant to			
21	Chapter 125 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, and based upon the Joint Petition by the Petitioners,			
22	·			
2	LILIANA C. GONZALEZ and MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ			
2	(Wife's name) (Husband's name)			
25	and all of the papers and pleadings on file, the Court finds as follows:			
26				
2 <del>3</del> 28	ii			
28	3. That this Court has the necessary UCCJA, UCCJEA and PKPA initial and continuing			
	jurisdiction to enter orders regarding child custody and visitation on the following children of the			

i

NAME CATHERINE ESTHER GONZALEZ	DATE OF BIRTH 02/17/1996	
MICHAEL IFOVANY GONZALEZ	12/26/2001	
MICHAED SECTION TO CONTRACT OF THE SECTION OF THE S		
4. That this Court <u>does not</u> have the necessar	ry UCCJA, UCCJEA and PKPA jurisdiction	
to enter orders regarding custody and visitation of the fo	llowing children of the union or adopted by	
the parties, and said issues must be decided in the child	ren's present "home state":	
NAME	DATE OF BIRTH	
5. That this Court has complete jurisdiction	to enter this Decree and the orders	
regarding the distribution of assets and debts.		
6 That resident Petitioner LILIANA C	C. GONZALEZ has been, and is now,	
	ame or Wife's name)	
an actual bona fide resident of the State of Nevada and has actually been domiciled in the State of		
Nevada for more than six (6) weeks immediately prior to the commencement of this action, and		
••		
(His or Her)		
7. The Petitioners married on		
(Date of Marriage, including month, day and year)		
County of LOS ANGELES, State	of <u>CALIFORNIA</u> , (State in which you were married)	
(County in which you were married)	(State in which you were married)	
	4. That this Court does not have the necessar to enter orders regarding custody and visitation of the for the parties, and said issues must be decided in the child NAME  5. That this Court has complete jurisdiction regarding the distribution of assets and debts.  6. That resident PetitionerLILIANA (Husband's not an actual bona fide resident of the State of Nevada and Nevada for more than six (6) weeks immediately prior to intends to continue to make the State of NevadaHER_ (His or I or	

	and ever since that date have been, and still are, Husband and Wife.
3	8. That Petitioners have become, and continue to be, incompatible in marriage and no
4	reconciliation is possible and/or the mertion have the second
5	without cohabiting as Husband and Wife and Petitioners are entitled to a Decree of Divorce.
7	(is or is not)
8	each space.)
9 10	Husband N/A the alleged to be the Sether of the settle set
11	child is due to be born onN/A
12	(Date of expected birth)
13	10. That the Petitioners have entered into an agreement settling all issues regarding the
14 15	care, custody, visitation, health insurance, and child support of the child(ren) over which this Court
16	has jurisdiction, said agreement being in the best interests of the child(ren), and Petitioners have
17	requested that their agreement as set forth in their Joint Petition, a copy of which is attached hereto as
18	Exhibit A, be ratified, confirmed, and incorporated into their Decree as though fully set forth.
19	11. That the Petitioners have entered into an equitable agreement settling all issues
20	regarding the division and distribution of assets and debts, said agreement being an equitable one, and
21 22	Petitioners have requested that their agreement in their Joint Petition, a copy of which is attached
23	hereto as Exhibit A, be ratified, confirmed, and incorporated into their Decree as though fully set
24	forth.
25	12. That the Petitioners have entered into an agreement settling the issue of spousal
26 27	support and request that their agreement as set forth in their Joint Petition, a copy of which is attached
28	hereto as Exhibit A, be ratified, confirmed and incorporated into their Decree as though fully set
	forth.

,			
1	(Initial only ONE space in statement 5. Print "not applicable" in the other spaces.)		
2 3	5. Wife is hereby restored to her former name of:		
3 4	LILIANA CAROLINA GARCIA		
5	NOT APPLICABLE Wife never changed her name and, therefore, does not request restoration of her former name.		
6 7	NOT APPLICABLE Wife shall retain her present name.		
8			
9	(IMPORTANT: The following paragraph (paragraph 6) is applicable to all decrees issued in the State of Nevada, but each County handles compliance with the requirements differently.		
10	Be sure to follow the specific instructions for the County in which you are obtaining your decree.)		
11	6. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that each party shall		
12			
13	submit the information required in NRS 125B.055, NRS 125.130 and NRS 125.230 on a separate		
14	form to the Court and the Welfare Division of the Department of Human Resources within ten days		
15	from the date this Decree is filed. Such information shall be maintained by the Clerk in a confidential		
16	manner and not part of the public record. The parties shall update the information filed with the		
17	Court and the Welfare Division of the Department of Human Resources within ten days should any of		
18	that information become inaccurate.		
19	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND PARTIES ARE PUT ON NOTICE that they are		
20	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND PARTIES ARE PUT ON NOTICE that they are		
21	subject to the requirements of the following Nevada Revised Statutes:		
22	NRS 125.510(6) regarding abduction, concealment or detention of a child:		
23	PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF ORDER:		
24	THE ABDUCTION, CONCEALMENT OR DETENTION OF A CHILD IN		
25	VIOLATION OF THIS ORDER IS PUNISHABLE AS A CATEGORY D FELONY		
26	AS PROVIDED IN NRS 193.130. NRS 200.359 provides that every person having a		
27	limited right of custody to a child or any parent having no right of custody to the child		
28	who willfully detains, conceals or removes the child from a parent, guardian or other		
	person having lawful custody or a right of visitation of the child in violation of an		

order of this court, or removes the child from the jurisdiction of the court without the consent of either the court or all persons who have the right to custody or visitation is subject to being punished for a category D felony as provided in NRS 193.130.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the terms of the Hague Convention of October 25, 1980, adopted by the 14th Session of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, apply if a parent abducts or wrongfully retains a child in a foreign country. The parties are also put on notice of the following provisions in NRS 125.510(8):

If a parent of the child lives in a foreign country or has significant commitments in a foreign country:

- (a) The parties may agree, and the court shall include in the order for custody of the child, that the United States is the country of habitual residence of the child for the purposes of applying the terms of the Hague Convention as set forth in subsection 7.
- (b) Upon motion of one of the parties, the court may order the parent to post a bond if the court determines that the parent poses an imminent risk of wrongfully removing or concealing the child outside the country of habitual residence. The bond must be in an amount determined by the court and may be used only to pay for the cost of locating the child and returning him to his habitual residence if the child is wrongfully removed from or concealed outside the country of habitual residence. The fact that a parent has significant commitments in a foreign country does not create a presumption that the parent poses an imminent risk of wrongfully removing or concealing the child.

#### NRS 125C.200 regarding relocation with minor children:

If custody has been established and the custodial parent or a parent having joint custody intends to move his residence to a place outside of this state and to take the child with him, he must, as soon as possible and before the planned move, attempt to obtain the written consent of the other parent to move the child from the state. If the noncustodial parent or other parent having joint physical custody refuses to give that consent, the parent planning the move shall, before he leaves the state with the child, petition the court for permission to move the child. The failure of a parent to comply with the provisions of this section may be considered as a factor if a change of custody is requested by the noncustodial parent or other parent having joint custody.

-		
1	NRS 125.450 regarding the collection of child support payments through mandatory	,
2	wage withholding or assignment of income.	
3	NRS 31A regarding the enforcement of a child support obligation and the collection of	f
4	delinquent child support.	
5	NRS 125B.145 regarding the review of child support at any time due to changed	ı
6	circumstances and at least every three years following the entry of the child support order.	
7	THIS IS A FINAL DECREE.	
8	Dated:	
9	- Defanyling	
10	DISTRICT JUDGE 5	
11		
12	Respectfully Submitted:	
13	(Print name) LILIANA C. GONZALEZ (Print name) MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ	
14	(Signature) (Signature) (Signature)	
15	(Address) 2767 LA CANADA ST. (Address) 2767 LA CANADA ST.	
16	LAS VEGAS, NV 89109 LAS VEGAS, NV 89109	
17	(Telephone) (702) 444-0987 (Telephone) (702) 444-0987	ĺ
18	Petitioner in Proper Person Petitioner in Proper Person	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		İ
27		
28		
ĺ		
ŀ		

•	
	Code: PSDD FILED
	Wife's name: LILIANA C. GONZALEZ Address: 2767 LA CANADA ST.
	JUL 18 LAS VEGAS, NV 89109
•	Telephone: (702) 444-0987
:	Husband's name: MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ Address: 2767 LA CANADA ST.  CLERK () TOURT
(	LAS VEGAS, NV 89109
•	Telephone: (702) 444-0987
	In Proper Person
8	IN THE EIGHTH IIIDICIAL DISTRICT COLUMN ON THE COLUMN
9	IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
10	IN AND FOR CLARK COUNTY
11	In the Metter of the Menters
12	
13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
14	(Wife's name)
15	and )
16	MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ
17	(Husband's name)
18	Joint Petitioners )
19	"AMENDED" JORIT PETITION FOR SURVINE PLANTS OF THE
20	"AMENDED" JOINT PETITION FOR SUMMARY DECREE OF DIVORCE
	Petitioners, (Wife's name) LILIANA C. GONZALEZ in proper person
21	MOUTE A CONTRACTOR
22	in the property and the
23	petition this Court, pursuant to the terms of Chapter 125 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, to grant
24	them a divorce. Petitioners respectfully show, and under oath, state to the Court that every
25	condition of NRS 125.181 has been met and further state as follows:
26	<b>L</b>
27	
28	The Petitioners married on SEPT. 20, 1995 in the (Date of Marriage, including month, day and year)
	(
ł	

jp\statewide petitions\joint petition with kids (#9b)

•	County of LOS ANGELES State of CALIFORNIA
;	(County in which you were married) (State in which you were married)
	and ever since have been, and still are, Husband and Wife.
4	и.
	5
6	
7	than six weeks before the filing of this action has been, an actual resident of the State of Nevada
9	and, during all this period of time has been actually, physically, present in and living in the Santa
10	of Nevada, and intends to continue to make the State of Nevada HER home for an
11	indefinite period of time. (His or Her)
12	The current addresses of the Petitioners are:
13	LILIANA C. GONZALEZ
14	(Wife's name)
15	2767 LA CANADA ST., LAS VEGAS, NV 89109
16	(Wife's mailing address)
17	
18	(Wife's residence address)
19	MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ
20	(Husband's name)
21	2767 LA CANADA ST., LAS VEGAS, NV 89109
22	(Husband's mailing address)
23	(Husband's residence address)
24	(11usband 5 lesidence audiess)
25	m.
26	That Petitioners have become, and continue to be, incompatible in marriage and no
27	reconciliation is possible, and/or the parties have lived separate and apart for more than one year
28	without cohabitation.

•	•		
	The state of residence of the children is as	s follows:	
	2 Name	State of residence	Length of time child
	3		has lived in that State
	CATHERINE ESTHER GONZALEZ	NEVADA	
	MICHAEL JEOVANY GONZALEZ	NEVADA	· <del></del>
	6		
8			
9			<del></del>
10			
11		VII.	
12			1
13	Both parents must in	<u>dy Of The Children</u> itial the following provision.	
14			
15	Join	nt Legal Custody	
16	2 6 9 M.A. 5 Per	titioners are fit and proper person	ns to be awarded joint
17	(Wife's initials) (Husband's initials)	•	
18	legal custody of the minor child(ren), <u>CATI</u>		
19		(Names of the children)	JEOVANY GONZALEZ
20	Í	VIII.	
21	Physical Custody of the Children  There are TWO different choices in the following paragraph: (a) joint physical custody; or		
22		UV UNK. Kath parties are to initi	alska (NNTE akasa
23	you agree upon. In the space for the ot	ner one, print "not applicable."	
24		(a)	
25		Physical Custody	
26	NOT API'LI CABLE Petit Wife's initials Husband's initials	tioners are fit and proper person	s to be awarded joint
27		NOT ADDITIONS	{
28	physical custody of the minor child(ren)	NOT APPLICABLE	
		(Names of children)	
ĺ			1

١.	
	1 (b)
	Primary Physical Custody
:	Petitioner LILIANA C. GONZALEZ is a fit and proper
•	Wife's initials Husband's initials (Name of custodial parent)
:	person to have the primary physical custody of the minor child(ren), CATHERINE ESTHER
(	(Names of children)
7	GONZALEZ & MICHAEL JEOVANY with visitation by the non-custodial parent as set forth
8	in the following visitation schedule.
9	IX.
10	TELEVISION SUMMER VISITATION
11	With the days the exchanges will take place, the times of the exchanges, and who will
12	provide transportation. Also include specific details regarding holiday sharing and summer vacation periods. Without very specific visitation, a Decree will not be granted.
13	I erms such as "reasonable visitation" and "visitation at reasonable times and places"
14	will not be accepted.
15	HUSBAND'S VISITATION SHALL CONSIST OF HAVING THE MINOR CHILDREN ALL
16	DAY SUNDAY FROM 9:00 A.M. AND SHALL DROP THEM OFF AT SCHOOL ON
17	TUESDAY 8:30 - A.M., AND TUESDAY THRU THURSDAY FROM 4:30 P.M. UNTIL
18	9:00 P.M. WHEN HE SHALL DROP THEM OFF AT MOTHER'S RESIDENCE.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	The parents may, from time to time, adjust the transportation provision or the weekends of
28	scheduled visitation by agreement.
,	I

jp\statewide petitions\joint petition with kids (#9b)

٠.	•			
·	HOLIDAY VISITATION			
	2			
	(You may add or subtract any holidays on the following list. If you choose not to exchange the children on a specific holiday, print "not applicable" in the spaces for that holiday. If no changes for the holiday are to be made in the			
	changes for the holidays are to be made in the regular visitation schedule, state that clearly in the next paragraph and print "not applicable" on the lines provided for the individual			
	holidays.)			
	The major holidays will be handled in the following manner:			
	(Name each specific holiday, such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, Passover, Hanukkah)			
	PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANT SHARE THE FOLLOWING HOLIDAYS WITH			
9	PLAINTIFF HAVING THE CHILDREN THE FIRST HALF OF THE DAY,			
10	STARTING AT 8:00 A.M. UNTIL 3:30 PM AND DEFENDANT SHALL HAVE			
1:	HEM FROM 3:30 P.M. UNTIL 10:00 P.M.: THANKSGIVING, CHRISTMAS.			
12	LASTER, NEW YEAR'S DAY, MEMORIAL DAY, FOURTH OF JULY & LABOR DAY			
13				
14				
15				
16				
17	1 NY			
18	(Father or Mother)			
19	in the year and each year thereafter.			
20				
21	Martin Luther King's Birthday will be alternated with NOT APPLICABLE having the child in			
22	(Father or Mother)			
	the year and each year thereafter.  (odd or even)			
23				
24	resident's Day will be alternated with NOT APPLICABLE having the child in (Father or Mother)			
25	the year and each year thereafter.			
26	(odd or even)			
27	Memorial Day will be alternated with NOT APPLICABLE having the child in			
28	Father or Mother) the year and each year thereafter.			
	(odd or even)			

jp\statewide petitions\joint petition with kids (#9b)

•	1 r
	Fourth of July will be alternated with NOT APPLICABLE having the child in
	the year and each year thereafter.  (odd or even)
	Labor Day will be alternated with NOT APPLICABLE having the child in (Father or Mother)
	(odd or even)
9	(Father or Mother)
10	(odd or even)
11 12	(Father or Mother)
13	(odd or even)
14 15	(Father or Mother)
16	(odd or even)
17 18	Child's birthday will be alternated with NOT APPLICABLE having the child in the year and each year thereafter.
19	(odd or even)
20 21	Mother shall have the child on Mother's Day and Father shall have the child on Father's Day.  Holidays not specifically time defined shall begin at 10:00 a.m. and end at 9:00 p.m. on
22	that same day. The parent who has the holiday will pick the child up and return the child to the
23 24	other parent at the end of the scheduled time.
25	Should a holiday fall on a three day weekend and it is the other parent's weekend to have the child(ren), the three day holiday will be handled as follows:
26 27	SAME AS ABOVE
28	

<b>`.</b> `	1 •	
	2	_
	3	_
	4	-
	And the second s	
	5 NOT APPLICABLE shall have a block time of time with the child(ren) for vacation (Father or Mother or both parents)	
	purposes. That length of time for vacation period shall be NOT APPLICABLE	
	(one week, two weeks, three weeks, one monti	ት <b>ነ</b>
	NOT APPLICABLE shall notify the other parent in writing at least	-,
9	(Father or Mother)	
10	(days or weeks) in advance of the choice of time.	
11	165	
12	Wife's initials Husband's initials Each parent SHALL notify the other if they take the (shall or shall not)	
13	child out of the State of Nevada for more than 24 hours, for any reason. Notification shall be made	
14	prior to leaving the State and shall include the date leaving the State, the destination, the date	1
15	returning to the State, the type of transportation, and, if possible, a telephone number for contact	
16	while the child is out of the State.	
17	Each parent shall immediately notify the other if any emergency occurs with the child such that	
18	medical treatment is sought.	
19	Wife's initials Husband's initials (shall or shall not)	
20	(State of State Hot)	l
21	child care giver for the child, including name, address, and telephone number.	
22	Wife's initials Husband's initials (shall not)  SHALL have the right of first refusal (shall not)	
23	Committee of manifest in the second	
24	to care for the child when the other parent is not available to care for the child for a period of	
25	hours. In other words, if the child is in Mother's custody and Mother is not available to care for the child for hours or more, Father shall be notified	i i
26	and given the right of first refusal to care for the child, before any third party is called in to care for	
27	the child. Mother has the same right of first refusal when the child is with Father and Father is not	
28	available to care for the child for TWO hours, or more.	

`, '	1 .
	2
	records, school records, and any other records generated for the benefit of, or on behalf of, the
3	l
•	X.
. 7	CHILD SUPPORT
8	
9	(ramer or Mother)
10	per month, per child, for a total monthly child support obligation of \$ per
11	month. The child support shall be paid on or before theday of each month.
12	We came to this agreement based upon the following information:
13	Truck-water and the state of th
14	Husband's gross monthly income is \$(Amount earned per month before deductions)
15	7
16	Wife's gross monthly income is \$(Amount earned per month before deductions)
17	(Initial either line 18, 24 or line 27. Do not initial all lines. Print N/A on those lines you do not use)
18	Trint N/A on those lines you do not use)
19	Husband Wife NOT APPLICABLE is the non-custodial parent and, the amount
20	Husband Wife (Mother or Father)
21	agreed upon on lines 10 - 12 above, is in compliance with NRS 125B.070
22	and is NOT APPLICABLE % of NOT APPLICABLE gross monthly income.
23	(18%, 25%, 29%, 31%) (Mother's or Father's)
24	OR
25	Husband Wife Support on lines 10 - 12 meets the statutory requirement
26	Husband Wife support on lines 10 - 12, meets the statutory requirement.
27	OR
28	
l	

٠.	1 2
	The support obligation amount that has been agreed upon by the
	parties is not the amount required in the statutes. Under the statutes,
	3
•	the child support obligation forFATHERwould be \$ 241.00
	(Mother or Father)
(	per month, per child. However, Petitioners have agreed to change that amount because:
•	
8	formula, and list your reasons here.)
9	BOTH PARTIES HAVE AGREED THAT NEITHER SHALL PAY CHILD SUPPORT TO
10	THE OTHER BECAUSE THEY WILL HAVE THE MINOR CHILDREN ALMOST EQUAL
11	TIME AND THEY WILL COVER THEIR EXPENSES EQUALLY.
12	
13	
14	
15	The amount of child support agreed upon meets the children's financial needs.
16	The child support obligation for each child shall continue until that child reaches the age of
17	eighteen years, or, if the child is still attending high school at the age of eighteen years, until the child
18	reaches the age of nineteen years or graduates from high school, or is otherwise emancipated, whichever occurs first.
19	
20	A wage assignment for the child support <u>WILL NOT</u> be immediately put in place.  (will or will not)
21	
22	Both parties must initial <u>ONE</u> of the following statements regarding child support.
23	
24	1. NOT APPLICABLE There is already a Child Support action through the District Attorney's Husband Wife Office and payment of the child support shall continue to be hardled
25	Husband Wife Office and payment of the child support shall continue to be handled through that office.
26	2. NOT APPLICABLE The children are receiving Welfare benefits and the Welfare Department
27	riusband wife nas, or will have, a child support case through the District Attorney's
28	Office and the District Attorney's Office shall continue to handle the child payments.
ı	

٠.	
	3. MAE Husband Wife No formal child support obligation has ever previously been established and this will be the first Court Order for child support and the parent
	paying child support will pay the support directly to the receiving parent
	4 4. NOT APPLICABLE Although this is the first Court Order for child support, the payment
	Husband Wife will be handled through the District Attorney's Office and the parent who will be collecting child support shall open the case with the District Attorney's Office.
	7
	8 XI.
	9 Health Care
	Provisions must be made for health care for the child(ren). If neither parent has health insurance on the child(ren), that must be stated. If the children are on Medicaid, that must be stated. Fill in all spaces, do not leave any spaces blank.
1	
1:	(is (are) as is (are) math
14	ARE NOT
-	(is/are or is/are not)
15	·
16	(Flusband of Wife of both parents)
17	employment.
18	
19	The parties shall each share, equally, any health expenses incurred on behalf of the child(ren)
20	that are not covered by insurance, and each party shall be responsible for one half of the deductible and
21	one half of the insurance premium.
22	: <b>XIII.</b>
23	Division of Assets
24	Both parties must initial ONLY ONE of the statements below Print "Net Applicable"
25	in the spaces you do not use. Be sure to address all retirement accounts, bank accounts and vehicles. Include VIN numbers when listing vehicles.
26	1. NOT APPLICABLEII of the community assets and property have been previously divided and
27	Husband Wife each is to keep the property they have in their possession at this time.
28	2. NOT APPLICABLE is no community property to be divided. Husband Wife
j	

٠.	
	3.MAS TG The community property should be divided as follows:
	(Include retirement accounts, bank accounts and vehicles with VIN
	3
	4 *THE FAMILY RESIDENCE LOCATED AND FILING DIVORCE
	5 AT 2767 LA CANADA ST., LAS VEGAS *WIFE SHALL VEED 2006 NEGOTION
	NEVADA. WIFE SHALL REFINANCE IN HER POSSESSION
	o THE PROPERTY UNDER HER SOLE
	7 NAME WITHIN THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF DECREE OF
	8 DIVORCE. WIFE SHALL RETAIN
	50% OF THE EQUITY, SUBJECT TO
	9 ANY ENCUMBRANCES THEREON.
1	TO THE EFFECT OF REFINANCING
-	UNDER HER SOLE NAME, HUSBAND
1	SHALL DELIVER EXECUTED QUIT- CLAIM DEED TO WIFE.
1:	
13	
1.	
14	
15	*50% OF THE REMAINING EQUITY
	IN THE FAMILY RESIDENCE LOCATED
16	AT 2767 LA CANADA ST., LAS
17	VEGAS. NV. SUBJECT TO ENCLIM-
18	BRANCES THEREON.
10	*HUSBAND SHALL KEEP THE 1996 CHEVY SILVERADO TRUCK IN HIS
19	POSSESSION IN EXCHANGE OF
20	PAYING FOR THE \$700.00 LEGAL
	FEES AND THE HOME DEPOT DEBT.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Of more more is needed attack additional about
	(If more room is needed, attach additional sheets but make sure the sheets are clearly identified as a continuation of the division of assets. Write only on one side of the page of additional sheets and
26	each additional sheet must be initialed by both parties.)
27	
28	
,	

٠,	(The following statement must be a see
	(The following statement must be initialed by both parties)
	Petitioners hereby certify that they have disclosed all community assets and debts and that there are no other community assets or debts for this Court to divide.
	5 XIV.
	Spangal Spanson (A)
	statements which makes a provision for spound and statements. If you initial one of the
	that statement. DO NOT LEAVE ANY SPACES BLANK IN THIS SECTION. PRINT "NOT APPLICABLE" IN ALL SPACES THAT ARE NOT APPLICABLE TO YOU.
1	0
1	
13	Husband Wife (Alimony) or any other monetary claim each may have against the other for support or maintenance.
13	<b>;</b>
14	NOT APPLICABLE Wife shall receive spousal support in the amount of \$ N/A per
15	//
16	Oyloch gue and payable on the N/A of each
17	OV-1 NOT APPLICABLE
18	
19	The spousal support shall begin onNOT APPLICABLE
20	(Date spousal support to begin)
21	and end on NOT APPLICABLE  (Date last snowed support and the last snowed support snowed support and the last snowed snowed support and the last snowed snowe
22	(Date last spousal support payment will be made)
23	
24	NOT APPLICABLE Husband shall receive spousal support in the amount of \$ N/A Husband Wife
25 i	(Amount Husband to receive)
26	peNOT APPLICABLE ue and payable on the N/A (Week or month) (Date amount the)
27	(Date amount due)
28	NOT APPLICABLE for a period of NOT APPLICABLE (Week or month) (Number of weeks, months or years)
40	(Number of weeks, months or years)
ł	

•	_
•	The spousal support shall begin on NOT APPLICABLE
	(Date spousal support to begin)
	and end on <u>NOT APPLICABLE</u>
	4 (Date last spousal support payment will be made)
	5 XV.
	Former Name
•	7 Initial ONLY ONE of the following statements and print "not applicable" in the second
:	filled in.
9	NOT APPLICABLE  Wife does not wish to return to her former name.
10	
11	
12	
13	LILIANA CAROLINA GARCIA
14	
15	
16	XVI.
17	Petitioners hereby request that this Court enter a Decree of Divorce, incorporating into that
18	
19	Decree the provisions made herein.
20	XVII.
21	It is understood by the Petitioners that entry of Decree of Divorce constitutes a final
22	adjudication of the rights and obligations of the parties with respect to the status of the marriage.
23	ſ
24	Petitioners each expressly give up their respective rights to receive written Notice of Entry of
25	any Decree and Judgment of Divorce and Petitioners give up their right to request a formal Findings of
26	Fact and Conclusions of Law, or to appeal any Judgment or Order of this Court made and entered in
27	these proceedings or the right to move for a new trial.
28	
1	

1	WIFE'S VERIFICATION
2	STATE OFNEVADA )
3	)ss: County of CLARK )
<b>4</b> 5	LILIANA C. GONZALEZ , being first duly sworn under
	(Wife's name)
6 7	penalties of perjury, deposes and says:
8	I am the Petitioner herein, and I have read the foregoing Joint Petition For Summary
9	Decree of Divorce and know the contents thereof; that the same is true to the best of my own
10	knowledge, except as to those matters therein stated upon information and belief, and as to those
11	
12	matters, I believe them to be true.
13	(Wife's signature)
14	SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me
15	this 18 day of July , 7007.
16	COUNTY OF CLARK ANA A MONTH No. 02-7728-1 My Approximent Expires Aug. 25, 2010
17	NOTARY PUBLIC
18	
19	STATE OF <u>NEVADA</u> ) ss:
20	County of CLARK
21	On this 18th day of July , 2007, personally
22	appeared before me, a Notary Public, LILIANA C. GONZALEZ, known or
23	(Wife's name)
24	proved to me to be the person who executed the foregoing Joint Petition For Summary Decree of
25	Divorce, and who acknowledged to me that she did so freely and voluntarily and for the uses and
26	purposes herein stated.
27	Notary Public - State of Nevada
28	NOTARY PUBLIC  COUNTY OF COUNTY  ANA A MONTH  ANA A MONTH
1	No. 02-77242-1 key Appointment Committee Commi

1	HUSBAND'S VERIFICATION
2	STATE OF NEVADA
3	)ss:
4	County of <u>CLARK</u> )
5	MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ , being first duly sworn under (Husband's name)
6	
7	penalties of perjury, deposes and says:
8	I am the Petitioner herein, and I have read the foregoing Joint Petition For Summary Decree of Divorce
9	and know the contents thereof; that the same is true to the best of my own knowledge, except as to
10	those matters therein stated upon information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be
11	true.
12	
13	(Husband's signature)
14	SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me
15	this 18th day of County of Clark Notary Public - State of Noveda COUNTY OF CLARK
16	ANA A. MONTTI  No. 02-77242-1 May Appointment Explans Aug. 25, 2018
17	NOTARÝ PUBĽIC
18	
19	STATE OF NEVADA )ss:
20	County of CLARK
21	On this 18th day of July , 2007, personally appeared
22	before me, a Notary Public, MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ, known or proved to me
23	(Husband's name)
24	to be the person who executed the foregoing Joint Petition For Summary Decree of Divorce, and
25	who acknowledged to me that he did so freely and voluntarily and for the uses and purposes
26	herein stated.  Notary Public - State of Nevaria  Notary Public - State of Nevaria  Notary Public - State of Nevaria
27	Notary Public Country OF CLARK COUNTRY OF CLARK
28	ANA A. MULTI- My Appointment Ecoires Aug. 23, 2010
	NOTARY PUBLIC

Electronically Filed 8/5/2020 8:48 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	000	
2	BYRON L. MILLS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 6745	
3	DANIEL W. ANDERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9955	
4	MILLS & ANDERSON.	
5	703 S. 8 <sup>TH</sup> STREET Las Vegas NV 89101	
6	(702) 386-0030 Attorneys for Plaintiff	
7		
8	DISTRICT COURT FAMILY DIVISION	
9	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
10	LILIANA C. GONZALEZ nka ) CASE NO.: D-07-376585-Z	
11	LILIANA C. GARCIA ) DEPT. NO.: F	The state of the s
12	Plaintiff, )	
13	v. Hearing Date: Hearing Time:	
14	MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ,	
15	Defendant.	
16	NOTICE: YOU ARE REQUIRED TO FILE A WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THIS	
17	MOTION WITH THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND TO PROVIDE THE UNDER-SIGNED WITH A COPY OF YOUR RESPONSE WITHIN 14 DAYS OF	1
18	YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS MOTION. FAILURE TO FILE A WRITTEN RESPONSE WITH THE CLERK OF THE COURT WITHIN 14 DAYS OF	1
19	YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS MOTION MAY RESULT IN THE REQUESTED RELIEF BEING GRANTED BY THE COURT WITHOUT HEARING PRIOR	)
20	TO THE SCHEDULED HEARING DATE	
21	MOTION TO ENFORCE DECREE OF DIVORCE AND OTHER RELATED	
22	RELIEF, AND NOTICE OF MOTION	
23	ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED: YES X NO	
24	COMES NOW the Plaintiff, LILIANA C. GONZALEZ nka LILIANA C	· •
25	GARCIA, by and through BYRON L. MILLS, ESQ., of the law firm of MILLS &	
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	ANDERSON her attorneys, and pursuant to the Nevada Revised Statutes and Eightl	
28		
40	II.	

AA000026

27

28

Judicial District Court Rules cited hereinbelow, hereby respectfully moves this Honorable Court for the following:

- 1) An Order of the Court directing Defendant to sign a Quitclaim Deed in favor of the Plaintiff on 2767 La Canada Street in exchange for 50% of the equity existing at the time of entry of the Decree;
- 2) For an Order of the Court awarding Plaintiff attorney's fees and costs in the amount of \$2,500.00.
- 3) For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper in the premises.

This Motion is made and based upon the papers and pleadings on file herein, Points and Authorities cited below, and the Affidavit of Plaintiff, attached hereto, and any oral argument entertained by the Court at hearing.

DATED this  $\angle / \sim$  day of August 2020.

By:

MILLS & ANDERSON

BYRON L. MILLS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 6745

DANIEL W. ANDERSON, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9955

703 S, 8<sup>TH</sup> STREET

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 386-0030

Attorneys for Plaintiff

#### POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I.

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Plaintiff, LILIANA C. GARCIA (Liliana), and the Defendant MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ (Miguel) were divorced by Decree of Divorce filed July 30, 2007. The

Decree contains the following provisions relevant to this motion:

#### WIFE SHALL RECEIVE THE FOLLOWING:

The Family residence located at 2767 La Canada St, Las Vegas Nevada. Wife shall refinance a property under her sole name within three months from the date of decree of divorce. Wife shall retain 50% of the equity, subject to any encumbrances thereon. To the effect of refinancing under her sole name, husband shall deliver executed quit claim deed to wife.

#### **HUSBAND SHALL RECEIVE THE FOLLOWING:**

50% of the remaining equity in the family residence located at 2767 La Canada St. Las Vegas NV subject to encumbrances thereon.

Pursuant to the foregoing language, Miguel was to sign a quitclaim deed in favor of Liliana to allow her to refinance the family residence within three months of entry of the decree. However, the parties continued to live together in the residence into 2008 and Miguel never signed the quitclaim deed. As such, the home has remained titled in both Liliana and Miguel's name since entry of the Decree of divorce in 2007. Liliana has continued to pay the mortgage and all associated expenses for the home since 2008 after Miguel's departure, while Miguel has contributed nothing toward the home's expenses.

Counsel contacted Miguel via 5.501 letter and requested that he sign a quitclaim deed in exchange for \$5000, which is the estimated value of Miguel's equity share that existed at the time the decree was entered. The parties had refinanced the home in 2006 at the height of the market and withdrew approximately \$50,000 in equity. As the Court is aware, market values plummeted in 2007 and, because of the cash out refinance in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Miguel maintained control over this money, which he used to make unpermitted improvements to the home and eventually, with Liliana's financial assistance, used to purchase a new home in 2008. However, Miguel failed to make the payments on the second home and in it went into foreclosure.

2006, the parties' home had little to no equity remaining by the time the decree was entered on July 30, 2007.

Miguel, through counsel, refused the offer and demanded 50% of the current existing equity in exchange for the quitclaim deed. Miguel's demand is clearly not what was intended at the time the decree was entered, nor is it supported by Nevada law. As such, Liliana has no choice but to file this motion Seeking the court's assistance in compelling Miguel to sign the quick claim deed so that she can refinance the home in her own name.

Based on the foregoing facts and argument set forth below, Liliana respectfully requests that the Court order Miguel to sign a quitclaim deed in Liliana's favor or authorize the Clerk of the Court to sign on Miguel's behalf. The Court should further order Liliana to pay Miguel the sum of \$5000 for his share in the equity of the residence. Finally, the Court should award Liliana attorney's fees and costs associated with this motion in the amount of \$2500.

#### II.

#### **ARGUMENT**

A. The Court should Order Miguel to Sign a Quitclaim Deed on 2767 La Canada Street in Liliana's Favor.

This Court has Continuing jurisdiction to enforce orders in the decree of divorce pursuant to NRS 125.240:

NRS 125.240 Enforcement of judgment and orders: Remedies.

The final judgment and any order made before or after judgment may be enforced by the court by such order as it deems necessary. A receiver may be appointed, security may be required, execution may issue, real or personal property of either spouse may be sold as under execution in other cases, and disobedience of any order may be punished as a contempt.

In this case, Liliana is requesting that the court issue in order directing Miguel to immediately sign a quit claim deed in Liliana's favor on the 2767 La Canada property.

This property was awarded to Liliana out right in the decree and, although Liliana is required to refinance the property, she cannot do so without Miguel signing the quitclaim deed in her favor. The decree directs Miguel to sign a quitclaim deed to facilitate the refinance and his failure to do so excuses Liliana's delay in refinancing the property.

Miguel's contention that he should receive 50% of the current equity is without merit. As a practical matter, Miguel has contributed nothing to the residence since leaving in 2008. In fact, he already received much of the equity value in the home when the parties refinanced in 2006 just a year before they divorced. Miguel used a portion the refinance money to purchase a new home in 2008 that he eventually let go into foreclosure. As such, there is no factual basis for Miguel to claim that he is entitled to 50% of the existing equity in the home.

There is also no legal basis for Miguel to make this claim. NRS 125.150 makes it clear that the Court makes a division of existing community property "in granting a divorce...". Absent some specific language in the decree to the contrary, the division occurs at the time the decree is entered. The only time language used in the Decree is the provision giving Liliana up to 3 months to refinance the home and pay Miguel his equity, assuming that Miguel had signed the quitclaim deed to allow the refinance. As such, the latest possible date that Miguel's equity could have been calculated would have been October 30, 2007, which was 3 months after entry of the decree.

There are no facts, statutes or caselaw that support Miguel's demand for 50% of the existing equity. To grant such a request would not be an "equal distribution" as required under Nevada law. Rather, it would result in a windfall to Miguel based on 12 years of equity increase due to Liliana's efforts to pay down the mortgage and separate property appreciation. Miguel is entitled to nothing more than what was originally ordered, which was 50% of the equity existing in July 30, 2007 when the decree of divorce was entered.

Should Miguel refuse to cooperate and sign the quit claim deed, the Court can authorize the clerk of the court to sign on Miguel's behalf pursuant to NRCP 70:

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

28

### RULE 70. JUDGMENT FOR SPECIFIC ACTS; VESTING TITLE

If a judgment directs a party to execute a conveyance of land or to deliver deeds or other documents or to perform any other specific act and the party fails to comply within the time specified, the court may direct the act to be done at the cost of the disobedient party by some other person appointed by the court and the act when so done has like effect as if done by the party. On application of the party entitled to performance, the clerk shall issue a writ of attachment or sequestration against the property of the disobedient party to compel obedience to the judgment. The court may also in proper cases adjudge the party in contempt. If real or personal property is within the State, the court in lieu of directing a conveyance thereof may enter a judgment divesting the title of any party and vesting it in others and such judgment has the effect of a conveyance executed in due form of law. When any order or judgment is for the delivery of possession, the party in whose favor it is entered is entitled to a writ of execution or assistance upon application to the clerk.

The foregoing rule provides the court with authority to either direct the clerk of the court to sign on Miguel's behalf, or to enter a judgment divesting Miguel of title on the property and vesting it solely in Liliana. For simplicity sake, Liliana requests that if Miguel refuses to sign the quit claim deed at the clerk of the court be directed to sign on his behalf.

## B. The Court Should Award Liliana with Attorney's Fees and Costs.

This motion was necessitated by Miguel's conduct. Liliana has requested in writing that Miguel simply sign a quitclaim deed in exchange for his share of the equity, which is all that the Decree requires. This is a simple issue that could have and should have been resolved by communication directly between the parties. However, Miguel has chosen not to participate. Liliana is therefore requesting attorney's fees and costs associated with this action in the amount of \$2,500.00.

Below are the Brunzell factors for the Court's consideration:

(1) the advocate's qualities, including ability, training, education, experience, professional standing, and skill;

All the attorneys at Mills & Anderson regularly practice in family law and regularly participate in CLE to stay current with the most recent changes in the law. MILLS & Anderson collectively has over 50 years of family law practice experience and all attorneys at the firm will likely be utilized at various stages in the case. No disciplinary action of any kind has been taken against any of the firm's lawyers during that time.

(2) the character of the work to be done; and (3) the work actually performed by the lawyer;

Liliana's attorneys have prepared all the substantive pleadings in this matter, researched and cited all appropriate law, with correct analysis and application of the law to the facts. They have met with Liliana in consultation and will be present at all hearings in this matter. The firm's actions have been in accordance to the highest ethical practices and consistent with the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct.

(4) the result, whether the attorney was successful and what benefits were derived.

Liliana anticipates a successful result at hearing as her requests are consistent with and supported by Nevada law. Liliana therefore requests an award of fees in an amount of \$2,500.00 and will submit a post-hearing memorandum at the Court's request.

#### III

#### **CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, LILIANA C. GONZALEZ NKA LILIANA C. GARCIA, respectfully requests that this Court enter the following orders:

1) An Order of the Court directing Defendant to sign a Quitclaim Deed in favor of the

1	Plaintiff on 2767 La Canada Street in exchange for 50% of the equity existing at the
2	time of entry of the Decree;
3	2) For an Order of the Court awarding Plaintiff attorney's fees and costs in the amount
4	of \$2,500.00.
5	3) For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper in the premises.
6	DATED this day of August 2020.
7	MILLS & ANDERSON
8	P M/le
9	By: DEFO
10	BYRON L. MILLS, ESQ. Meyada Bar No. 6745
11	DANIEL W. ANDERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9955
12	703 S. 8 <sup>th</sup> Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
13	(702) 386-0030 Attorneys for Plaintiff
14	Tittorne vs for Tidment
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

#### AFFIDAVIT OF LILIANA C. GARCIA IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

STATE OF NEVADA ) : ss.

COUNTY OF CLARK )

LILIANA C. GARCIA, being first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says:

- 1. I have provided all the information, dates and incidents for use in this Motion and state under oath that the information contained therein and which I have read, corrected and approved, is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- 2. That based on my knowledge, belief and information and as though repeated herein by my affidavit, I incorporate the facts and incidents of the motion as though fully reprinted in this affidavit.

WHEREFORE, I respectfully request that this Court grant the relief requested.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

LILIANĂ C. GARCIA

DATED this <u>OY</u> day of August, 2020.

NOTARY PUBLIC

For Said County and State

M. MURPHY
Notary Public - State of Nevada
County of Clark
APPT. NO. 14-14803-1
My App. Expires Sept. 27, 2022

## DISTRICT COURT FAMILY DIVISION CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Plaintiff/Petitioner  v.  Miguer A- Gonzarez  Defendant/Respondent	Case No. D-07-376585-Z  Dept. F  MOTION/OPPOSITION FEE INFORMATION SHEET			
Notice: Motions and Oppositions filed after entry of a final order issued pursuant to NRS 125, 125B or 125C are subject to the reopen filing fee of \$25, unless specifically excluded by NRS 19.0312. Additionally, Motions and Oppositions filed in cases initiated by joint petition may be subject to an additional filing fee of \$129 or \$57 in accordance with Senate Bill 388 of the 2015 Legislative Session.				
Step 1. Select either the \$25 or \$0 filing fee in	the box below.			
S25 The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is subject to the \$25 reopen fee.  S0 The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is not subject to the \$25 reopen				
fee because:  ☐ The Motion/Opposition is being filed before a Divorce/Custody Decree has been entered.				
☐ The Motion/Opposition is being filed solely to adjust the amount of child support established in a final order.				
☐ The Motion/Opposition is for reconsideration or for a new trial, and is being filed within 10 days after a final judgment or decree was entered. The final order was entered on				
☐ Other Excluded Motion (must speci				
Step 2. Select the \$0, \$129 or \$57 filing fee in	the box below.			
S0 The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is not subject to the \$129 or the \$57 fee because:				
☐ The Motion/Opposition is being filed in a case that was not initiated by joint petition. ☐ The party filing the Motion/Opposition previously paid a fee of \$129 or \$57.				
-OR- □ S129 The Motion being filed with this form is subject to the S129 fee because it is a motion to modify, adjust or enforce a final orderOR-				
☐ S57 The Motion/Opposition being filing with this form is subject to the \$57 fee because it is an opposition to a motion to modify, adjust or enforce a final order, or it is a motion and the opposing party has already paid a fee of \$129.				
Step 3. Add the filing fees from Step 1 and Step 2.				
The total filing fee for the motion/opposition I am filing with this form is:				
Party filing Motion/Opposition: Puintif	Date 9 5 20			
Signature of Party or Preparer Staron L. Mills				

1 OPPC The Grigsby Law Group A Professional Corporation 3 Aaron D. Grigsby, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9043 4 2880 W. Sahara Ave, 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 (702) 202-52356 (702) 944-7856 7 aaron@grigsbylawgroup.com

Attorney for Miguel A. Gonzalez

DISTRICT COURT FAMILY DIVISION

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

LILIANA C. GONZALEZ,

Plaintiff,

Case No. D-07-376585-Z

**Electronically Filed** 8/17/2020 8:33 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

VS.

Dept. No. F

MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ,

Defendant,

18

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20 21

22

24

23

26 27

25

28

## OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO ENFORCE DECREE OF DIVORCE AND OTHER RELATED RELIEF AND COUNTERMOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS

COMES NOW, Defendant, Miguel A. Gonzalez (hereinafter "Miguel" or "Mr. Gonzalez"), by and through his counsel, Aaron D. Grigsby, Esq. of the Grigsby Law Group A.P.C, in Opposition to Motion to Enforce Decree of Divorce and Other Related Relief and Countermotion to Strike and for Attorney's Fees This Opposition and Countermotion are and Costs. made and based upon the attached Points and

2880 W. Sahara Ave, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 he Grigsby Law Group Tel: (702) 202-5235

Authorities, Pleadings and papers on file in this action.

#### MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

#### I. Introduction

Plaintiff's Motion is replete with half-truths, misstatements and unsupported generalities. Her Motion cites no relevant law to support the claims made therein. Plaintiff's legal reasoning is either defective or non-existent as to the issues before the court. Her "facts" are backed by little tangible evidence and are largely irrelevant to the outcome of the issues in this case. We will nevertheless step through and refute, point by point, the facts and law randomly flung in the pending Motion.

Plaintiff has filed a pleading devoid of accurate facts and contrary to applicable law. The irony is this case does not need nor deserve the level of litigation and hostility Plaintiff is trying to create. Such litigious and punitive acts are in fact part of Plaintiff's modus operendi designed to vex, harass and annoy Miguel Gonzalez.

## II. Enforcement of the Decree of Divorce

The parties were divorced by stipulated Decree on July 20,  $2007^1$ . Plaintiff appears to be proceeding under the supposition that this court has

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> It is requested that pursuant to NRS 47.130(b) this Court take judicial notice of the Decree of Divorce filed January 26, 2011.

"[c]ontinuing jurisdiction to enforce orders in the decree of divorce pursuant to NRS 125.240." The undersigned on behalf of Mr. Gonzalez unsuccessfully attempted to disabuse Plaintiff of her fanciful notion prior to the filing of her frivolous motion. Plaintiff's attempt to enforce the property division provisions the 2007, Decree of Divorce is not only barred by the six (6) year statute of limitations<sup>2</sup> but contrary to the plain language of their contractual arrangement.

The Nevada Supreme Court has stated that "the Nevada Legislature did not grant the family divisions of the district courts the authority to endlessly enforce divorce decrees except where the Legislature specifically provided for enforcement regardless of the age of the claim<sup>3</sup>." Plaintiff has filed her Motion to Enforce approximately thirteen (13) years after the Decree of Divorce. Additionally, the Court also held that NRS 125.240 does not apply to the enforcement of a Decree of Divorce.

Alternatively, Plaintiff contends that the Decree of Divorce somehow limited Miguel Gonzalez's interest to the value of the real property as it was in 2007. Plaintiff presents no evidence as to what the value of the property at issue was in 2007. The figure

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> NRS 11.190(1)(a)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Davidson v. Davidson, 132 Nev. 709, 382 P.3d 880, 884 (2016)

outlined in her motion of five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) appears to be nothing other than rank speculation on behalf of Plaintiff. It also fails to recognize and acknowledge that Miguel Gonzalez was disadvantaged by having the encumbrance on the property remain on his credit for the last thirteen (13) years. Mr. Gonzalez has been unable to finance his own home due to being on the loan for the real property at issue. Finally, Plaintiff's contention to this Court is contrary to the language of the parties contractual agreement.

#### III. Enforcement of the Parties Contract

When parties to pending litigation enter into a settlement, they enter into a contract<sup>4</sup>. "A settlement agreement is an agreement to terminate or forestall all or part of a lawsuit. A settlement contract also has the attributes of a judgment in that it is decisive of the rights of the parties and serves to bar reopening of the issues settled. Absent a fundamental defect in the agreement itself the terms are binding on the parties<sup>5</sup>." "While a settlement agreement will not necessarily involve a judicial determination, it does resolve the relative legal rights and liabilities of the parties,

<sup>4</sup>Mack v. Estate of Mack, 125 Nev. 80, 95, 206 P.3d 98, 108 (2009)

<sup>28 | 5</sup> Brown v. Bryant, Inc., 24 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup>

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

28

eliminating the need to try any issues resolved by the agreement  $^{6}$ ."

Nevada law has long held that parties free to enter into contracts so long as their contracts are not unconscionable, illegal, or in violation of public policy<sup>7</sup>. Nevada favors the settlement of disputes by agreement of the parties and, ordinarily, will enforce the Agreement which the parties have made, absent any fraud, mistake, or overreaching. This is as true of agreements made in the process of the termination of the marriage by divorce as of any other kind of negotiated settlement.

A district court has authority to enter a Decree of Divorce pursuant to the terms agreed to by the parties. As set forth in May v. Anderson:

Because a settlement agreement is a contract, its construction and enforcement are governed by principles of contract law. Basic contract principles require, for an enforcement contract, an offer and acceptance, meeting of the minds, and consideration. With respect to contract formation, preliminary negotiations do not constitute a binding contract unless the parties have agreed to all material terms. valid contract cannot exist when material terms are lacking or insufficiently certain A contract can be formed, and definite. however, when the parties have agreed to the material terms, even though the contract's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Power Co. v. Henry, 130 Nev. 182, 188, 321 P.3d 858, 862 (2014)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>D.R. Horton, Inc. V. Green, 120 Nev. 549, 558, 96 P.3d 1159, 1165 (2004)

exact language is not finalized until later. In the case of a settlement agreement, a court cannot compel compliance with material terms remain uncertain. The court must be able to ascertain what is required of the respective parties<sup>8</sup>.

Where a document is clear on its face, it will be construed from the written language and enforced as written<sup>9</sup>. The written language of Decree of Divorce clearly outlines all of the terms of the settlement agreement. Contracts will be construed from their written language and enforced as written<sup>10</sup>.

Nevada law has held that a party assumes the risk of entering into a contract. "If [a] party is aware at the time he enters into a contract 'that he has only limited knowledge with respect to the facts to which the mistake relates but treats his limited knowledge as sufficient," the court will allocate the risk of the mistake to that party<sup>11</sup>. Plaintiff is a sophisticated adult who is represented by legal counsel with decades of experienced in dealing with the legal system. Subsequent to viewing the language in the Decree, Plaintiff should be aware that he

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> May v. Anderson, 121 Nev. 668, 672, 119 P.3d 1254, 1257 (2005)

Ellison v. California State Auto Ass'n, 106 Nev. 601, 603, 797 P.2d 975, 977 (1990)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Kaldi v. Farmers Ins. Exch., 117 Nev. 273, 278, 21 P.3d 16, 20 (2001)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> <u>Land Baron Inv., Inc. v. Bonnie Springs Family LP</u>, 131 Nev. Adv. Op. 69, 356 P.3d 511, 517 (2015)

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

28

position is not well grounded in law or fact.

Where "a written contract is clear and unambiguous on its face, extraneous evidence cannot be introduced to explain its meaning 12." "'[T] he existence of a separate oral agreement as to any matter on which a written contract is silent, and which is not inconsistent with its terms, may be proven by An analysis of the July 30, 2007, Decree of parol<sup>13</sup>.'" Divorce demonstrates clear and unambiguous terms resolving the outstanding issues contained in this Specifically the Decree of Divorce states in matter. pertinent part that Miguel Gonzalez shall receive "50% of the remaining equity in the family residence located at 2767 La Canada St., Las Vegas Nevada subject to encumbrances thereon." There is no language limiting Mr. Gonzalez's interest to a specific period in time.

In fact, the only limiting language in the Decree is where Plaintiff is given "three months from the date of the Decree of Divorce" to refinance the property. Plaintiff failed to refinance the residence within the time period specified by the Decree of Divorce. As such, both parties still retain undivided interest in the property located at 2767 La Canada

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Geo. B. Smith Chemical v. Simon, 92 Nev. 580, 582, 555 P.2d 216, 216 (1976)

<sup>13</sup> Crow-Spieker #23 v. Robinson, 97 Nev. 302, 305, 629 P.2d 1198, 1199 (1981)
(quoting Alexander v. Simmons, 90 Nev. 23, 24, 518 P.2d 160, 161 (1974))

Street. Further, Plaintiff's argument that equality dividing the value of the property at issue is "not what was intended at the time the [D]ecree was entered" is inadmissible parol evidence.

#### VI. PAROL EVIDENCE

"The parol evidence rule forbids the reception of evidence which would vary or contradict the contract, since all prior negotiations and agreements are deemed been merged therein. 14" Evidence can to have contradict the written received which does not instrument, but which refers to the very existence of the contract and tends to show that no valid and effective contract ever existed15. "a written Where face, and unambiguous its clear on contract is extraneous evidence cannot be introduced to explain its meaning 16." "'[T]he existence of a separate oral agreement as to any matter on which a written contract is silent, and which is not inconsistent with its terms, may be proven by parol 17. "

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

<sup>2021</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Daly v. Del E. Webb Corp., 96 Nev. 359, 361, 609 P.2d 319, 320 (1980).

<sup>15</sup> Id. at 362, 609 P.2d at 320 (construing Child v. Miller, 74 Nev. 223, 327
P.2d 342 (1958))

Geo. B. Smith Chemical v. Simon, 92 Nev. 580, 582, 555 P.2d 216, 216 (1976)

<sup>17</sup> Crow-Spieker #23 v. Robinson, 97 Nev. 302, 305, 629 P.2d 1198, 1199 (1981)
(quoting Alexander v. Simmons, 90 Nev. 23, 24, 518 P.2d 160, 161 (1974))

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

28

The parol evidence rule is a rule of "substantive law and not merely one of evidence 18." When the Nevada Supreme Court defined the parol evidence rule as one substantive law it completely removed the discretion of this Court to hear parol evidence. As such Plaintiff can not offer any evidence that would contradict the terms of the stipulated Decree Divorce and this Court is prohibited from hearing any such evidence if the Court would find the even information helpful in making its determination. Any such testimony would be irrelevant and subject to objection under Nevada law19.

#### FAILURE TO FILE FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORM V.

Plaintiff failed to file the required Financial Disclosure Form (hereinafter "FDF") to support her request for attorney's fees. A general FDF must be filed in support of any motion or countermotion that includes a request to establish or modify child support, spousal support, fees and allowances, exclusive possession of a residence, or any matter involving money to be paid by a party<sup>20</sup>. A FDF must be filed within 2 judicial days of the filing of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> State ex rel. List v. Courtesy Motors, 95 Nev. 103, 106, 590 P.2d 163, 165 (1979); Alling v. Universal Mfg. Corp., 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 718, 731 (Cal. App. 1992)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> NRS 48.025

<sup>20</sup> EDCR 5.506(a)

motion, countermotion, or opposition it supports, and may only be filed in open court with leave of the judge upon a showing of excusable delay<sup>21</sup>. This Court is empowered to construe Plaintiff's failure to file an FDF as an admission that she is not entitled to an award of fees<sup>22</sup>.

## VI. Attorney's Fees for the Motion

Plaintiff request attorney's fees for her defective Motion. "A litigant has no right to have his attorneys' fees paid by his opponent or opponents." This is not a case in which Attorney's fees or cost should be awarded to the Plainitff. In Love, the Court concluded that a prevailing party on a post-decree motion may be entitled to an award of attorney's fees pursuant to NRS 18.010(2)(b). Specifically, NRS 18.010(2)(b) allows for attorneys:

Without regard to the recovery sought, when the court finds that the claim, counterclaim, cross-claim or third-party complaint or defense of the opposing party was brought without reasonable ground or to harass the prevailing party.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> EDCR 5.506(d)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> EDCR 5.606(g)

<sup>23</sup> Smith v. Crown Fin. Servs., 111 Nev. 277, 281, 890 P.2d 796, 771-72 (1995).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> <u>Love v. Love</u>, 114 Nev. 572 (1998)

Miguel Gonzalez has been forced to incur additional and unnecessary attorney's fees to protect his rights and should be awarded his attorney's fees and cost in the amount of three thousand five hundred (\$3,500.00) dollars. Given the Plaintiff's filing of a frivolous Motion, Mr. Gonzalez should be awarded his fees and costs associated with this matter.

#### COUNTERMOTION

#### Attorney's Fees and Costs

It is respectfully submitted that Miguel A. Gonzalez is entitled to an award of attorney's fees for having to defend this matter. The Nevada Supreme Court has concluded that a prevailing party on a motion may be entitled to an award of attorney's fees<sup>25</sup> pursuant to statute<sup>26</sup>. Specifically:

Without regard to the recovery sought, when the court finds that the claim, counterclaim, cross-claim or third-party complaint or defense of the opposing party was brought without reasonable ground or to harass the prevailing party<sup>27</sup>.

Miguel Gonzalez has been forced to incur additional attorney's fees to protect his rights and should be awarded his attorney's fees and costs in the amount of three thousand five hundred dollars (\$3,500.00).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Love v. Love, 114 Nev. 572 (1998)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> NRS 18.010(2)(b)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> NRS 18.010(2)(b)

The Grigsby Law Group 2880 W. Sahara Ave, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Tel: (702) 202-5235 Plaintiff's Motion is not meritorious or wellgrounded in fact.

The Nevada Supreme Court adopted in <u>Brunzell<sup>28</sup></u>, factors that should be considered by a district court in determining an award of attorney's fees. Counsel for Ittipol Muangsopa is an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada. The undersigned has been practicing law in the State of Nevada in excess of ten (10) years and his primary focus is and has been, family law during that entire period and no less than 80% (eighty percent) of his practice is dedicated solely to the same.

Miguel Gonzalez's counsel is a member of the State Bar of Nevada, the ABA, and the Family Law Section and is in good standing with the State Bar of Nevada. The undersigned has met with his client on several occasions, prepared the extensive pleadings in this matter, expended his time herein and will appear in court with Mr. Gonzalez. That while there were not unusual or novel issues that added to the expense of representation, time was of the essence and had to proceed expeditiously.

That the time and labor expended in this matter was counsel's own and required in the zealous representation of the client and the fee charged was customary and standard in the profession, and was

<sup>28</sup> Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank, 85 Nev. 345 (1969)

billed hourly at the fixed rate of three hundred seventy-five (\$375.00) dollars per hour. Further, Plaintiff has filed a frivolous Motion with the obvious intent to harass Mr. Gonzalez. Miguel Gonzalez is therefore requesting three thousand five hundred (\$3,500.00) dollars in attorney's fees and costs for responding to Plaintiff's Motion.

#### CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's motion is fatally defective. Miguel Gonzalez is hereby requesting that this Court deny the entirety of relief requested in Plaintiff's Motion and award him attorney's fees, costs and sanctions.

DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2020

THE GRIGSBY LAW GROUP
A Professional Corporation

By: /s/ Aaron Grigsby
Aaron D. Grigsby, Esq.
2880 W. Sahara Ave
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
aaron@grigsbylawgroup.com

# The Grigsby Law Group 2880 W. Sahara Ave, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Tel: (702) 202-5235

### DECLARATION OF MIGUEL GONZALEZ

- I, Miguel Gonalez, do hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the assertions of this Declaration are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. As for those assertions based on belief, I believe them to be true.
  - 1.That I am the co-petitioner in the abovereferenced matter;
  - 2. That I was forced to incur additional and unnecessary attorney's fees in defending against Plaintiff's Motion and I am requesting that this Court award me applicable fees and cost associated with this matter;
  - 3. That I have read the foregoing Opposition and Countermotion and the factual averments it contains are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, except as to those matters based on information and belief, as to those matters, I believe them to be true. The factual averments contained in the Opposition and Countermotion are incorporated here as if set forth in full.

Miguel Sonzalez

# The Grigsby Law Group 2880 W. Sahara Ave, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Tel: (702) 202-5235

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that service of the Opposition to Motion to Enforce Decree of Divorce Countermotion Attorney's Fees and Costs was made on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2020, pursuant to NRCP 5(b) and pursuant to EDCR 8.05(2), EDCR 8.05(f) and Administrative Order 14-2, by mandatory electronic service through the Eighth Judicial District Court's electronic filing system or United States Mail to the following address.

Byron L. Mills, Esq Mills & Anderson 703 S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

/s/ Jackson Newark

Employee of The Grigsby Law Group

10/22/2020 12:09 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT 1 **NEO** DANIEL W. ANDERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9955 BYRON L. MILLS, ESO. 3 Nevada Bar No. 6745 MILLS & ANDERSON 703 S. 8<sup>TH</sup> STREET 5 Las Vegas NV 89101 (702) 386-0030 6 Attorney for Plaintiff attorneys@millsnv.com 7 **DISTRICT COURT** 8 **FAMILY DIVISION** 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 LILIANA C. GONZALEZ nka CASE NO.: D-07-376585-Z 11 LILIANA C. GARCIA DEPT. NO.: 12 Plaintiff, 13 V. 14 MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ, 15 16 Defendant. 17 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER 18 TO: ALL PARTIES IN INTEREST 19 20 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that 21 pursuant to N.R.C.P. Rule 58, an ORDER OF THE COURT was entered in the 22 above-entitled matter on October 21, 2020, a copy of which is attached hereto. 23 DATED this day of October, 2020. 24 MILLS & ANDERSON 25 26 BYRON L. MILLS, ESQ. 27 Bar No. 6745 703 South Eighth Street 28 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorney for Plaintiff

AA000051

**Electronically Filed** 

Gonzalez D-07-376585-Z

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I am an employee of MILLS & ANDERSON and that on the ZZ day of October, service of the **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER** and **ORDER** was made by:

- 1. Via Electronic Service to: <a href="mailto:aaron@grigsbylaw.com">aaron@grigsbylaw.com</a>
- Via e-mail to:
   Liliana Garcia: (lilicg72@yahoo.com)

MARY O'DONNELL, an employee of MILLS & ANDERSON

Electronically Filed 10/21/2020 6:37 PM CLERK OF THE COURT

ORD

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

BYRON L. MILLS, ESQ.

Nevada Bar#6745

MILLS & ANDERSON

703 S. 8th Street

Las Vegas NV 89101

(702) 386-0030

attorneys@millsnv.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

DISTRICT COURT FAMILY DIVISION CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

LILIANA C. GONZALEZ nka
LILIANA C. GARCIA
Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO.: D-07-376585-Z
DEPT. NO.: F

MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ,

Defendant.

## ORDER OF THE COURT

Pursuant to Administrative Order 20-17, the Court may issue a decision on the papers. After review of the pleadings on file, the Court enters its Findings and Orders in a Minute Order issued September 21, 2020, which is reiterated hereinbelow. Therefore, the hearing set for September 23, 2020 is vacated.

THE COURT FINDS that it has personal jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter jurisdiction over the case.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that a Motion to Enforce Decree of Divorce and Other Related Relief was filed by Petitioner, Liliana Gonzalez to enforce the terms of the parties Decree of Divorce which granted her the right to the marital residence. Respondent, Javiar Gonzalez was to sign a Quitclaim Deed and Liliana was to refinance the home within 3 months.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that Lilian's Motion was scheduled on this Court's calendar on Wednesday September 23, 2020.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that an Opposition to the Motion was filed alleging that Liliana failed to timely assert her rights to the home, pursuant to *Davidson v. Davidson*, thus, she no longer had the right to 100% ownership of the home, and that she was a 50% co-owner with her ex-husband.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that in Miguel's Opposition, Miguel argues that he is entitled to 50% of the entirety of the home, even though Liliana was awarded the home in the Decree, has paid on the mortgage for 13 years and Miguel has made no financial contribution since the parties divorce. Miguel alleges that because there has been no quitclaim or refinance, that he is still entitled to assert his rights to the payment of the equity value of the home from 2007 and of the entirety of the increase in equity that exists from that date to now.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that it has considered the arguments from each party, and has weighed the facts and the law.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that it is persuaded by Liliana that she should prevail, as she is entitled to be transferred her ownership interest in the home, based upon the holding in *Kuptz-Blinkinsop v.Blinkinsop*, 466 P.3d 1271 (2020). In *Blinkinsop* the Court found that when there is an interest in real property that is granted, the decree is not affected by the 6-year statute of limitations.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS in this regard that Lilian's argument is persuasive, and her Motion is hereby Granted.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that contemporaneously, Miguel failed to assert his rights to the money judgment owed to him in 2007, which was half of the equity at the time of the parties' divorce (alleged by Liliana to be approximately \$5000 after withdrawing equity in a loan, and the housing market crash). This Court has no information or record as it relates to the value of the home in 2007.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that Miguel failed to assert his right for this money payment within six years of the Decree of Divorce and, therefore, is time barred from the ability to assert the right to said monies.

Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Lilian's Motion to Enforce is granted in part. Miguel is ordered to sign the Quitclaim Deed in favor of the Plaintiff on 2767 La Canada Street., Las Vegas, Nevada.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Liliana's attorney's fees request may be placed on this Court's calendar in the form of a Motion pursuant to NRCP 54, and supported by the requisite documents and information necessary for the Court to determine the fees which were reasonable and necessary to pursue this action.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Miguel's Countermotion is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Attorney Mills to prepare the Order consistent with this Minute Order.

DATED	thia	dorrof	2020
DAILD	ums	day of	Dated this 21st day of October, 2020

DISTRICT JUDGE

A89 4A1 F094 6AC6 Denise L Gentile District Court Judge

Lenex

Submitted by:

MILLS & ANDERSON

RV

28

BYRON L. MILLS, ESQ.

Wevada Bar #6745

703 S. 8th Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorney for Plaintiff

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

**Divorce - Joint Petition** 

**COURT MINUTES** 

November 30, 2020

D-07-376585-Z

In the Matter of the Joint Petition for Divorce of:

GONZALEZ, LILIANA C

and GONZALEZ, MIGUEL A

November 30,

8:00 AM

Minute Order

2020

**HEARD BY:** Gentile, Denise L **COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** Maureen Torkelson

**PARTIES:** 

Catherine Gonzalez, Subject Minor, not

present

GONZALEZ, LILIANA C, Petitioner, not

present

GONZALEZ, MIGUEL A, Petitioner, not

present

Michael Gonzalez, Subject Minor, not present

Byron Mills, Attorney, not present

Aaron Grigsby, Attorney, not present

#### **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- NRCP 1 and EDCR 1.10 state the procedure in district courts shall be administered to secure efficient, speedy, and inexpensive determinations in every action. Pursuant to Administrative Order 20-17, this Court may issue a decision on the papers.

COURT FINDS that a Motion for Stay was filed on 11/9/2020; COURT FINDS that an Opposition thereto was filed on 11/17/2020. COURT FINDS that the matter is set for 12/15/2020. COURT has read and considered the papers and pleadings on file herein. COURT FINDS it is persuaded by the Plaintiff, Liliana's argument, and finds that a stay is not warranted, as Defendant has not met the 4 prong test, as set forth in NRAP 8.

Accordingly, the Motion for Stay is hereby DENIED.

The Motion presently set for December 15, 2020 is hereby VACATED.

PRINT DATE:   11/30/2020	Page 1 of 2	Minutes Date:	November 30, 2020
--------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------------

Notice: Journal entries are prepared by the courtroom clerk and are not the official record of the Court.

#### D-07-376585-Z

CLERK'S NOTE: On 11/30/2020 a copy of the Court's Minute Order was provided to each Attorney via email, if an email address is on record with the Court; if no email address is available then the Minute Order was mailed to the physical address of record. (mt)

**INTERIM CONDITIONS:** 

**FUTURE HEARINGS:**