

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Marilee Brown, Marilou Brown,
Gregory J. Brown (for Beverly M.
Brown's Family),

Appellants,

vs.

St. Mary's Regional Medical Center;
Tammy Evans (erroneously named as
Tami Evans); Prem Reddy, M.D.,
Tanzeel Islam, M.D.; and Shridevi
Challapalli, M.D.

Respondents.

Case No.: 81434

District Court

Electronically Filed
Case No. 2000422
Aug 05 2020 07:25 a.m.

Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Appeal from the Second Judicial
District Court, the Honorable Kathleen
Drakulich Presiding

RESPONDENTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS
APPEAL FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION

MICHAEL E. PRANGLE, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 8619

RICHARD D. DEJONG, ESQ

Nevada Bar No. 15207

HALL PRANGLE & SCHOONVELD, LLC

1140 North Town Center Drive, Ste. 350

Las Vegas, Nevada 89144

Phone: 702-889-6400

Facsimile: 702-384-6025

efile@hpslaw.com

Attorneys for Respondents

St. Mary's Regional Medical Center,

Tammy Evans (erroneously named as Tami Evans),

Prem Reddy, M.D., Tanzeel Islam, M.D. and Shridevi Challapalli, M.D.

1 **I. ARGUMENT**

2 In their Motion, Respondents moved to dismiss Plaintiffs’ appeal because
3 under well-established Nevada law, *i.e.*, *Salman v. Newell*, 110 Nev. 1333, 1335-
4 36 (1994) and NRS 7.285, nonlawyers Marilee Brown, Marilou Brown and
5 Gregory Brown are not authorized to represent “Beverly M. Brown’s family”
6 and/or serve as “representatives” of Beverly Brown (or her estate) in an appeal
7 before this Court. (Resp. Mtn. at 2-3; Aplt. Resp. at 2). In their Response,
8 Plaintiff’s do not mention, much less specifically challenge this Court’s holding in
9 *Salman* (or NRS 7.285). Nor do they dispute that they are not licensed attorneys
10 and/or that they are nonetheless attempting to assert claims, and appear before this
11 Court on appeal from an order dismissing those claims, on behalf of other
12 person(s) and/or entities, *i.e.*, Beverly M. Brown’s family/estate.
13
14
15
16
17

18 Instead, Plaintiffs argue, *inter alia*,¹ that in addition to themselves, they are
19 authorized to bring claims – and appear before this Court – on behalf of “Beverly
20 M. Brown’s family” and as “Personal Representatives” of Beverly M. Brown
21
22
23

24 ¹ In opposition to Defendants’ Motion, Plaintiffs Response also raises arguments
25 addressing their appeal on its merits. *See e.g.*, Pls. Resp. at 5-6. Defendants do not
26 address these arguments in this Reply because they are not relevant to the sole
27 question of whether Plaintiffs, as nonlawyers, are authorized to assert claims and
28 appear before this Court on behalf of person(s) and/or entities other than
 themselves. In the event Plaintiffs appeal is not dismissed, Defendants will fully
 address these arguments in their brief on the merits.

under various Nevada statutes, *e.g.*, NRS 11.310, 41.085, 41.130, 41.1395 (Pls. Resp. at 3-4). However, none of the referenced statutes provide Plaintiffs with such authority. While Plaintiffs are entitled to represent *themselves* in a suit asserting claims brought under or in connection with the aforementioned statutes, *see* SCR 44, as nonlawyers they are prohibited from bringing any claims or appearing before this Court on behalf of or as “representatives” of any person or entity other than themselves. *See Salman, supra*. Accordingly, because Plaintiffs are seeking review of the district court’s June 8, 2010 Order on behalf of other member(s) of Beverly M. Brown’s family and/or her estate, their notice of appeal is invalid and their appeal should be dismissed because “no rule or statute permits a [nonlawyer] to represent any other person . . . or any other entity in the district court or in this court.” *Salman*, 110 Nev. 1335-36.

II. CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs have filed a notice of appeal seeking review of the district court’s order dismissing their complaint, including claims which they as nonlawyers improperly filed on behalf of “Beverly M. Brown’s family” and as “representatives” of Beverly Brown. As Plaintiffs cannot represent any other person or entity in this Court, their notice of appeal is the product of the unauthorized practice of law and it fails to confer jurisdiction on this Court. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that this Court dismiss this appeal for

1 lack of jurisdiction because no rule or statute authorizes Plaintiffs to represent any
2 other person or entity in this Court.

3 Dated this 5th day of August, 2020.
4
5

6 HALL PRANGLE & SCHOONVELD, LLC

7
8 # # # #

By: /s/ Michael E. Prangle

MICHAEL E. PRANGLE, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 8619

RICHARD D. DEJONG, ESQ

Nevada Bar No. 15207

1140 North Town Center Drive, Suite 350

Las Vegas, NV 89144

*Attorneys for Respondents St. Mary's Regional
Medical Center, Tammy Evans (erroneously
named as Tami Evans), Prem Reddy, M.D.,
Tanzeel Islam, M.D. and Sridevi Challapalli, M.D.*

HALL PRANGLE & SCHOONVELD, LLC
1140 NORTH TOWN CENTER DRIVE, STE. 350
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89144
TELEPHONE: 702-889-6400 FACSIMILE: 702-384-6025

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing **RESPONDENTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION** was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on the 5th day of August, 2020.

I further certify that that I am an employee of HALL PRANGLE & SCHOONVELD, LLC, and that on the 5th day of August, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **RESPONDENTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION** via:

- X E-Flex Electronic Service;
- X U.S. Mail, first class postage pre-paid to the following parties at their last known address;

Marilee Brown
Marilou Brown
45 Nives Court
Sparks, NV 89441
Plaintiff in Pro Per

Edward J. Lemons, Esq.
Alice Campos Mercado, Esq.
Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg
6005 Plumas street, 3rd Floor
Reno, NV 89519
Attorneys for Defendant Mark McAllister, M.D.

/s/Arla Clark
An employee of HALL PRANGLE & SCHOONVELD, LLC