

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MARILEE BROWN; MARILOU
BROWN; AND 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 SRIDEVI
CHALLAPALLI, M.D.; AND MARK
MCCALLISTER, M.D.,

Respondents.

No. 81434-COA

FILED

JAN 07 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER REGARDING PRO BONO COUNSEL

This is an appeal from an order dismissing appellants' claims for medical malpractice and associated claims. Having considered the documents transmitted by the district court, this court has determined that the appointment of pro bono counsel to represent appellants would assist this court in reviewing this appeal. By this order, the court expresses no opinion as to the merits of this appeal.

Pro bono counsel is an attorney who provides legal services without charge for the benefit of the public good. The appointment of pro bono counsel provides attorneys with an opportunity to volunteer legal services in furtherance of their professional responsibility and, at the same time, allows financially eligible litigants access to quality legal representation without cost. Counsel will be appointed for purposes of this appeal only and will participate in oral argument. Currently, the Pro Bono Committee of the Appellate Litigation Section of the State Bar of Nevada

(Pro Bono Committee), in conjunction with the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, has developed a pro bono appellate program to assist the public and this court. This case is hereby referred to the program established by the Pro Bono Committee to evaluate whether appellants can benefit from the program.

Accordingly, the clerk of this court is directed to transmit a copy of this order and the attached district court order and case summary to the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada for financial eligibility screening. If appellants qualify and do not object to pro bono counsel, the Legal Aid Center in cooperation with the Pro Bono Committee shall locate a volunteer attorney from the program to represent appellants. Once an attorney is located, the attorney shall file a notice of appearance in this court within 60 days from the date of this order. Briefing and oral argument will be scheduled thereafter. Alternatively, if appellants are not financially eligible or object to pro bono representation, or if a volunteer attorney cannot be located, the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada shall notify this court in writing within 60 days from the date of this order. In such case, oral argument will not be held. The proceedings in this appeal shall be suspended pending further order of this court.

It is so ORDERED.

 , C.J.

cc: Gregory J. Brown
Marilee Brown
Marilou Brown
Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg
Hall Prangle & Schoonveld, LLC/Las Vegas
Hall Prangle & Schoonveld/Reno
Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Barbara E. Buckley,
Executive Director
Anne R. Traum, Coordinator, Appellate Litigation Section,
Pro Bono Committee, State Bar of Nevada
Kelly Dove

Docket No. 81434

Brown v. St. Mary's Regional Medical Center

Appellants filed a medical malpractice action against respondents alleging that their mother, Beverly Morris Brown, died as a result of negligent treatment she received from respondents. The district court granted respondents' motion to dismiss, determining that dismissal was required as appellants failed to include the requisite affidavit pursuant to NRS 41A.071. In their informal opening brief, appellants argue that at least some of their claims were not based upon medical negligence and thus, should not have been dismissed for failure to include an affidavit.

3060

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE
COUNTY OF WASHOE

MARILEE BROWN, MARILOU BROWN,
GREGORY J. BROWN (for Beverly M.
Brown's family),

Plaintiffs,

Case No.: CV20-00422

Dept. No.: 1

vs.

ST. MARY'S REGIONAL MEDICAL
CENTER; TAMI EVANS; PREM REDDY,
M.D.; MARK McALLISTER, M.D.; TANZEEL
ISLAM, M.D.; SRIDEVI CHALLAPALLI,
M.D., and DOES I through X, inclusive; ROE
BUSINESSES I through X, inclusive,

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT
FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH NRS 41A.071**

Currently before the Court is Defendants Saint Mary's Regional Medical Center, Tammy Evans (erroneously named as Tami Evans), and Prem Reddy, M.D.'s (collectively "Defendants Saint Mary's") *Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint for Failure to Comply with NRS 41A.071* ("Motion") filed March 26, 2020. On April 13, 2020, Plaintiffs filed an *Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss – to Include Amendments/Clarification, et al as Specified in Their Civil Complaint; and Amendment Request Here to Include Additional Plaintiff (Return Service of Summons and Additional Laintiff [sic] Documentation Submitted Separately)* ("Opposition"). On April 20, 2020, Defendants filed a *Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss* and submitted the Motion to the Court for

1 consideration. On May 15, 2020, Defendants Saint Mary's filed an *Errata to Defendants St. Mary's*
2 *Regional Medical Center, Tammy Evans, and Prem Reddy M.D.'s Reply in Support of Motion to*
3 *Dismiss*. Plaintiffs filed *Plaintiffs' (a) Opposition to Defendant Tammy Evans' (Tiffany Coury) /*
4 *Prem Reddy MD's May 15, 2020 Errata Related to Plaintiffs' May 14, 2020 (& Prior) Default*
5 *Motions Against Defendants Tanzeel Islam and Sridevi Chapallapalli; (b) in Support of Plaintiffs'*
6 *May 6 / 14, 2020 Supplemental & Dismissal Filings Nexused to Defendants' Replies/Errata; (c) With*
7 *Plaintiffs' Notice of Their Request for Submission of all Adjudicated Filings for no Response / Other*
8 *(Separate Filings)* on May 28, 2020.

9 **I. Background**

10 On March 3, 2020, Plaintiffs filed the *Civil Complaint* ("Complaint") in this case which
11 alleges medical negligence / malpractice. *See generally* Compl. On April 13, 2020, Plaintiffs filed
12 an *Amendment to Civil Complaint / Return Service of Summons* ("Amendment to Complaint") which
13 sought to substitute Tiffany Coury for Defendant Tammy Evans and add Mr. Gregory J. Brown as a
14 Plaintiff but did not alter or add to the factual allegations set forth in the Complaint. *See generally*
15 *Am. to Compl.* Plaintiffs allege Beverly Morris Brown ("Ms. Brown") died on March 5, 2019 as a
16 result of the treatment she received in December 2018 and February 2019 from Defendants. Mot. at
17 3:8-12.

18 **II. Relevant Legal Authority**

19 In reviewing a motion to dismiss pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 12(b)(5)
20 for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the "court must construe the pleadings
21 liberally and accept all factual allegations in the complaint as true . . . [and] draw every fair inference
22 in favor of the non-moving party. 'A complaint will not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless
23 it appears beyond a doubt that the plaintiff could prove no set of facts which, if accepted by the trier
24 of fact, would entitle him or her to relief.'" *Blackjack Bonding v. City of Las Vegas Mun. Court*, 116
25 Nev. 1213, 1217, 14 P.3d 1275, 1278 (2000) (citing *Simpson v. Mars. Inc.*, 113 Nev. 188, 190, 929
26 P.2d 966, 967 (1997)). As Nevada is a "notice-pleading" jurisdiction, a complaint need only set forth
27 sufficient facts to demonstrate the necessary elements of a claim for relief so that the defending party
28 has "adequate notice of the nature of the claim and relief sought." *Hay v. Hay*, 100 Nev. 196, 198,

1 678 P.2d 672, 674 (1984); see also *Stockmeier v. Nevada Dep't of Corrections*, 124 Nev. 313, 316,
2 183 P.3d 133, 135 (2008) (dismissing a claim, pursuant to NRCP 12(b)(5), is proper where the
3 allegations are insufficient to establish the elements of a claim for relief).

4 NRS 41A.071 provides:

5 If an action for professional negligence is filed in the district court, the district
6 court shall dismiss the action, without prejudice, if the action is filed without an
7 affidavit that:

- 8 1. Supports the allegations contained in the action;
- 9 2. Is submitted by a medical expert who practices or has practiced in an area that
10 is substantially similar to the type of practice engaged in at the time of the
11 alleged professional negligence;
- 12 3. Identifies by name, or describes by conduct, each provider of health care who
13 is alleged to be negligent; and
- 14 4. Sets forth factually a specific act or acts of alleged negligence separately as
15 to each defendant in simple, concise and direct terms.

13 The Nevada Supreme Court has held that pursuant to NRS 41A.071 “a complaint filed without
14 a supporting medical expert affidavit is void ab initio and must be dismissed. Because a void
15 complaint does not legally exist, it cannot be amended . . . and an NRS 41A.071 defect cannot be
16 cured through amendment.” *Washoe Med. Ctr. v. Second Judicial Dist. Court of State of Nev. ex rel.*
17 *Cty. of Washoe*, 122 Nev. 1298, 1301–02, 148 P.3d 790, 792 (2006). The court went on to state that
18 the “shall” in NRS 41A.071 “is mandatory and does not denote judicial discretion.” *Id.* at 1303
19 (citations omitted).

20 NRS 41A.015 defines professional negligence as: “[t]he failure of a provider of health care, in
21 rendering services, to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge used under similar circumstances
22 by similarly trained and experienced providers of health care.” When a plaintiff’s claim is for injuries
23 resulting from negligent medical treatment, the claim sounds in medical malpractice. *Szymborski v.*
24 *Spring Mountain Treatment Center*, 133 Nev. 638, 642, 403 P.3d 1280, 1284 (2017) (citations
25 omitted). *Szymborski* stands for the proposition that “allegations of breach of duty involving medical
26 judgment, diagnosis, or treatment indicate that a claim is for medical malpractice.” *Id.* When a
27 plaintiff’s claim is for injuries resulting from negligent acts that did not affect the medical treatment
28 of a patient, the claim sounds in ordinary negligence. *Id.* (citations omitted). If the alleged breach of

1 a duty of care set forth in the complaint is one that was based upon medical art or science, training or
2 expertise, then it is a claim for medical malpractice. *Id.* (citations omitted). By extension, if the jury
3 can only evaluate the plaintiff's claims after presentation of the standards of care by a medical expert,
4 then it is a medical malpractice case. *Id.* (citing, *Humboldt Gen. Hosp. v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court*,
5 132 Nev. 544, 550–51, 376 P3d 167, 172 (2016)). If, on the other hand, the reasonableness of the
6 health care provider's actions can be evaluated by jurors on the basis of their common knowledge and
7 experience, then the claim is likely based in ordinary negligence. *Id.* 133 Nev. at 642 (citations
8 omitted). Given the subtle distinction, a single set of circumstances may sound in both ordinary
9 negligence and medical malpractice, and an inartful complaint will likely use terms that invoke both
10 causes of action. *Id.* (citing, *Mayo v. United States*, 785 F.Supp.2d 692, 695 (M.D. Tenn. 2011)). It
11 is the nature of the grievance rather than the form of the pleadings that determines the character of
12 the action. *Id.* (citing, *State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Wharton*, 88 Nev. 183, 186, 495 P.2d 359,
13 361 (1972)).

14 **III. Analysis**

15 Defendants Saint Mary's argue all of Plaintiffs' factual claims arise out of medical care,
16 treatment, and alleged breaches of the medical providers' duties of care and therefore sound in
17 medical malpractice. Mot. at 4:3–5; 5:19–22. Defendants Saint Mary's maintain all of Plaintiffs'
18 allegations fall within the definition of professional negligence pursuant to NRS 41A.015. *Id.* at
19 5:26–6:4. Defendants Saint Mary's contend Plaintiffs failed to satisfy the affidavit requirement
20 pursuant to NRS 41A.071 and the Complaint must be dismissed. *Id.* at 6:5–7:10.

21 Plaintiffs request a hearing to clarify this matter. Opp. at 1:15. Plaintiffs contend their claims
22 in the Complaint rely upon other statutes. *Id.* at 2:13–14. Plaintiffs assert the Complaint can be tolled
23 pursuant to NRS 41A.097(2) and that should be considered as a mitigating factor and for this Court
24 to maintain all the issues until Plaintiffs can obtain a medical expert affidavit because such a dismissal
25 would be prejudicial to Plaintiffs as they may not be able to re-file any medical issues due to running
26 of the statute of limitations. *Id.* at 2:15–3:5; 5:3–6. Plaintiffs assert it is within this Court's discretion
27 whether to dismiss the action. *Id.* at 3:5–6. Plaintiffs insist the word "shall" in NRS 41A.071 is not
28 mandatory and argue cases should be decided upon the merits rather than dismissed on procedural

1 grounds. *Id.* at 3:11–4:7. Plaintiffs claim because pleadings of a pro per litigant are held to a less
2 stringent standard, the Complaint should not be dismissed. *Id.* at 4:8–9. Plaintiffs insist there are
3 factual allegations in the Complaint that are non-medical including: (1) failure to follow protocol; (2)
4 lack of communication; (3) age/other discrimination / jeopardy to the elderly; (4) negligence
5 jeopardizing patients/others safety related to infectious persons; and (5) failure to expedite medical
6 documentation that jeopardized this patient’s case. *Id.* at 4:9–14; 5:6–12. Plaintiffs state that in the
7 Complaint they requested the ability to amend the Complaint, and they should be allowed to do so in
8 this instance without having all of their non-medical claims dismissed as that would cause significant
9 hardship. *Id.* at 5:12–16.

10 Plaintiffs then claim they themselves are sufficiently familiar with this case to prepare a joint
11 affidavit that illustrates their education, experience, and caretaking of patients that will suffice until
12 Plaintiffs can obtain a proper medical expert affidavit if required. *Id.* at 6:11–24. Plaintiffs assert it
13 is difficult to obtain written or testimonial support from medical experts because they fear reprisal,
14 damage to their reputation, or denial of hospital rights in speaking out. *Id.* at 8:9–16. Plaintiffs allege
15 Defendants Saint Mary’s failed to perform an investigation into the facts surrounding Ms. Brown’s
16 death and instead engaged in a coverup. *Id.* at 9:16–20. Plaintiffs maintain a jury can evaluate
17 Plaintiffs claims despite any procedural shortcomings, especially those based on the nonmedical
18 functions. *Id.* at 11:14–19. Plaintiffs state that it is the substance rather than the form of the claim
19 that must be examined. *Id.* at 16:21–17:1. Plaintiffs request this Court allow them to amend the
20 Complaint to: (1) add age/other discrimination violations; (2) add Gregory J. Brown as a Plaintiff; (3)
21 clarify, correct, and amend the Complaint; and (4) time to secure a medical expert affidavit if
22 necessary.¹ *Id.* at 20:13–22.

23 In the Reply, Defendants Saint Mary’s maintain the application of NRS 41A.071 focuses on
24 whether a defendant is a provider of health care and whether the allegations in a complaint
25 contemplate a failure in rendering of services by that provider. Reply at 5:3–7. Defendants Saint
26 Mary’s argue that all of the allegations are in relation to medical care and treatment provided to Ms.

27
28 ¹ The Amendment to the Complaint adding/substituting parties was filed concurrently with the Opposition on April 13, 2020 and does not allege any claims for discrimination or request additional time to secure a medical expert affidavit.

1 Brown at Saint Mary's Regional Medical Center, a licensed hospital and the respective physicians
2 who practice there. *Id.* at 5:8–18. Defendants Saint Mary's maintain a plaintiff cannot avoid
3 application of NRS 41A.071 through artful pleading and emphasize Plaintiffs' claims arise out of
4 breaches of duties involving medical judgment, diagnosis, or treatment. *Id.* at 5:19–6:2. Defendants
5 Saint Mary's point out that the Nevada Supreme Court has held that "allegations of negligent
6 maintenance of medical records are properly characterized as medical malpractice." *Id.* at 6:5–8;
7 *Jones v. Wilkin*, 111 Nev. 1335, 1338, 905 P.2d 166, 168 (1995). Defendants Saint Mary's argue
8 Plaintiffs seek to impose liability for treatment Ms. Brown received for a foot wound, an atrial
9 fibrillation, an improper amputation, low oxygen levels, and a pulmonary injury. Reply at 6:14–16.
10 Defendants Saint Mary's state these allegations clearly implicate professional negligence and the
11 Complaint repeatedly describes these claims as one for medical malpractice. *Id.* at 6:14–19.
12 Defendants Saint Mary's also contend Plaintiffs lack standing to bring this suit as self-represented
13 litigants on behalf of their mother's estate. *Id.* at 7:1–8:2.

14 Having reviewed the pleadings on file and having reviewed the facts and legal support set
15 forth therein, this Court finds good cause to grant the Motion. For NRS 41A.071 to apply to this
16 action, it must be an action for professional negligence. Plaintiffs allege "Defendants did commit
17 Medical Negligent actions to include Medicinal, Treatment, Judgment, protocol, Etc [sic] errors,
18 against the Plaintiffs which led to the Wrongful Suffering and Death of their mother" Compl. at
19 14:26–27. This language or substantially similar language is repeated three times in this section of
20 the Complaint. *Id.* at 14:22–15:13. Further, all of the allegations contained in the Complaint directly
21 involve medical judgment, diagnosis, or treatment that Ms. Brown allegedly received or should have
22 received, which the Nevada Supreme Court has held means the claim sounds in professional
23 negligence. *Szymborski*, 133 Nev. at 642.

24 This Court has reviewed the allegations contained in the Complaint. Contrary to Plaintiffs'
25 claim that there are factual allegations in the Complaint that are non-medical (to include failure to
26 follow protocol, lack of communication, age/other discrimination/jeopardy to the elderly, negligence
27 jeopardizing patients/others safety related to infectious persons, and failure to expedite medical
28 documentation that jeopardized this patient's case) each of these allegations is inextricably tied to a

1 claim for professional negligence and Plaintiffs cannot now claim otherwise for the sole purpose of
2 remedying a violation of NRS 41A.071.

3 To evaluate whether the medical professionals in this case followed established protocol
4 necessarily requires expert testimony to explain the standard of care. *Id.* The protocol Plaintiffs claim
5 was not followed related to the amount and type of medication administered to Ms. Brown which is
6 rooted in professional negligence, as the Complaint contends that the physicians prescribed the
7 medication. Compl. at 3:22–27.

8 As to the alleged “lack of communication,” the only usage of the word “communication” in
9 the Complaint deals with “the communication between providers and patients/patients’ families so as
10 to ensure the improvement of quality care, healthcare Improvement and less Medical Medicinal,
11 Judgment mistakes/error that lead to the deteriorating medical condition, suffering and preventable
12 death of patients as what happened in this case” Compl. at 16:26–17:2. The failure of
13 communication alleged is related directly to quality of care, the deteriorating medical condition,
14 suffering and preventable death of Ms. Brown and thus is rooted in professional negligence.
15 *Szymborski*, 133 Nev. at 642. In some instances, the failure to communicate is co-extensive with the
16 failure to follow procedure, and in other instances it overlaps with the failure to provide medical
17 documentation. Mot. at 2:20–22; 9:16–10:2. Regardless, these do not form an independent basis for
18 an ordinary negligence claim such that an expert affidavit would not be required in this case.

19 Further, the Complaint does not set forth a claim for age discrimination and there is no factual
20 explanation or legal support for the allegation of “jeopardy to the elderly.” Any negligence claim
21 derived from exposure to an infected patient as alleged by Plaintiffs is purported to be the direct result
22 of the medical decisions made for and treatment provided to Ms. Brown and as such falls squarely
23 within the scope of a professional negligence claim. *Szymborski*, 133 Nev. at 642. As for the failure
24 to expedite the medical documentation in this case, the Nevada Supreme Court has held “allegations
25 of negligent maintenance of medical records are properly characterized as medical malpractice.”
26 *Jones*, 111 Nev. at 1338. Failure to expedite the medical documents is pertinent to the diagnosis and
27 treatment of Ms. Brown and therefore does not state a claim for ordinary negligence. *Szymborski*,
28 133 Nev. at 642.

Moreover, and importantly, there are no separate claims for relief pled in the Complaint related to the purported non-medical claims. The Complaint sets forth a "Statement of Facts Main Medical Malpractice Information Summary," a "Background History," a "Primary Background Related to ISSUE AT HAND- Patient Beverly M. Brown," "ISSUE AT HAND FOR MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE/MALPRACTICE- History and Details," "MAIN MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE SUMMARY INFORMATION" and "MAIN MEDICAL MALPRACTICE INFORMATION (REITERATED)." With the exception of the "Background" sections, each of these headings references "Medical Malpractice" or "Medical Negligence" or both. There are no allegations in the Complaint related to ordinary negligence. By way of example, a reading of the section labeled "MAIN MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE SUMMARY INFORMATION" reveals allegations that pertain to Ms. Brown that relate to lack of care on behalf of treating physicians to include failure to look at Ms. Brown's "extensive medical information provided by the family," an "error in a pulmonary procedure by the Interventional Radiologist as they had been attempting to remove fluid from this patient's lungs" and removal of "critical life saving medication" "needed to prevent arterial blockages" that "ultimately led to Beverly M. Brown's blockages, stroke, heart stress/CHF UNCONTROLLABLE AFIB, returned infectious Pneumonia and Death at Renown hospital." *Id.* at 9:5-10; 10:18-20. To the extent Plaintiffs are now contending that claims for ordinary negligence were pled, they have failed to set forth the necessary elements of those claims and/or factual allegations sufficient to support those claims denying Defendants "adequate notice of the nature of the claim and relief sought" in violation of *Hay*.

Accordingly, this Court finds that Plaintiffs' Complaint (as originally filed and as amended to add or substitute parties) states a claim or claims for professional negligence and as such NRS 41A.071 applies. Plaintiffs admit that the Complaint does not contain a medical expert affidavit. Opp. at 3:3-6. As noted above, the Nevada Supreme Court has held that "a complaint filed without a supporting medical expert affidavit is void ab initio and must be dismissed. Because a void complaint does not legally exist, it cannot be amended . . . and an NRS 41A.071 defect cannot be cured through amendment" as well as pointing out that the word "shall" in NRS 41A.071 "is mandatory and does not denote judicial discretion." *Washoe Med. Ctr.*, 122 Nev. at 1301-02, 1303.

1 The Nevada Supreme Court has acknowledged that NRS 41A.071 applies to all medical malpractice
2 actions even if the person is representing themselves. *Anderson v. Sierra Surgery Hosp.*, Case No.
3 58753, 2012 WL 2308670, *1 (2012).

4 As such, this Court finds that dismissal of Plaintiffs' Complaint is proper pursuant to NRS
5 41A.071. This Court does not reach Defendants Saint Mary's argument regarding Plaintiffs' standing
6 because it has found the Complaint to be void ab initio pursuant to NRS 41A.071.

7 Based upon the foregoing and good cause appearing,

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants Saint Mary's *Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs'*
9 *Complaint for Failure to Comply with NRS 41A.071* is GRANTED and this case is DISMISSED to
10 include all motions that are pending or have been submitted to this Court.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED this 8th day of June, 2020.

13 

14 KATHLEEN DRAKULICH
15 DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 CASE NO. CV20-00422

3 I certify that I am an employee of the SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of
4 the STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE; that on the 8th day of June, 2020, I
5 electronically filed the **ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS'**
6 **COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH NRS 41A.071** with the Clerk of the
7 Court by using the ECF system.

8 I further certify that I transmitted a true and correct copy of the foregoing document by the
9 method(s) noted below:

10 **Electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system which will send a notice**
11 **of electronic filing to the following:**

12 EDWARD LEMONS, ESQ. for MARK MCALLISTER

13 RICHARD DE JONG, ESQ. for TAMI EVANS, PREM REDDY, M.D.,
14 ST. MARY'S REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, et al.

15 ALICE CAMPOS MERCADO, ESQ for MARK MCALLISTER

16 **Deposited to the Second Judicial District Court mailing system in a sealed envelope for postage**
17 **and mailing by Washoe County using the United States Postal Service in Reno, Nevada:**

18 MARILEE BROWN
19 45 NIVES COURT
20 SPARKS, NV 89441

21 MARILOU BROWN
22 45 NIVES COURT
23 SPARKS, NV 89441

24 GREGORY J BROWN
25 45 NIVES COURT
26 SPARKS, NV 89441

27 
28 Department 1 Judicial Assistant