

IN THE SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA

Electronically Filed
Jan 11 2022 10:04 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Jeffrey Reed, Petitioner, vs. Alecia Reed nka Draper and Alicia Draper, as Conservator for Emily Reed, Respondent.	Supreme Court #: 82575 (Appeal) District Court Case #: 05D338668
---	--

ERRATA RESPONDENT'S ANSWERING BRIEF

(This Errata Respondent's Answering Brief is submitted because it was discovered that the original brief that was e-filed was not in final form and did not contain the authorities and table of contents and authorities, which have been corrected in this Errata.)

BRENNAN LAW FIRM

/s/ Elizabeth Brennan
ELIZABETH BRENNAN
Nevada Bar No. 7286
7340 Eastgate Road, Suite 170
Henderson, Nevada 89011
Phone: (702) 419-2133
Attorney for Respondent Emily Reed

NRAP 26.1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The undersigned counsel of record certifies that the following are persons and entities as described in NRAP 26.1(a) and must be disclosed. These representations are made in order that the judges of this court may evaluate possible disqualification or recusal.

The following persons/entities are disclosed:

Elizabeth Brennan, Respondent and Counsel for Respondent.

Brennan Law Firm, LLC, Counsel for Respondent.

As to the Respondent, there are no other parent corporations or publicly-held companies at issue. Respondent is not using a pseudonym.

Dated this 10th day of January, 2022.

BRENNAN LAW FIRM

/s/ Elizabeth Brennan

ELIZABETH BRENNAN

Nevada Bar No. 7286

Brennan Law Firm

Nevada Bar No. 7286

7340 Eastgate Road, Suite 170

Henderson, Nevada 89011

Phone: (702) 419-2133

Attorney for Respondent Emily Reed

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NRAP 26.1 Disclosure Statement	i
Table of Contents	ii
Table of Authorities	iii - iv
Argument	1 - 15
<u>ISSUE #1:</u> The District Court did <u>NOT</u> err in <u>NOT</u> finding good cause to extend discovery, extend time for rebuttal expert, and continue the trial.	1 - 5
<u>ISSUE #2:</u> The District Court did <u>NOT</u> err in refusing to allow Jeff to re-call Emily as a witness.	5 - 6
<u>ISSUE #3:</u> The District Court did <u>NOT</u> err in allowing Emily to raise claims of post-majority support after she reached majority.	6 - 8
<u>ISSUE #4:</u> The District Court did <u>NOT</u> err in relying upon a diagnosis of Disassociated Identity Disorder after Emily reached the age of majority and graduated from High School as part of his determination that Emily is handicapped.	8 - 12
<u>ISSUE #5:</u> The District Court did <u>NOT</u> err in determining that Emily is <u>NOT</u> self-supporting.	13 - 14
<u>ISSUE #6:</u> The District Court did <u>NOT</u> err in granting constructive post majority support.	14 - 15
Conclusion	15 - 16
Certificate of Compliance	17
Certificate of Service	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE
<i>Blackburn v. State</i> , 129 Nev. 92, 95, 294 P.3d 422, 425 (2013)	6
<i>Ellis v. Carucci</i> , 123 Nev. 145, 149, 161 P.3d 239, 242 (2007)	8
<i>Klabacka v. Nelson</i> , 133 Nev. 164, 175, 394 P.3d 940, 949 (2017)	6
<i>Leavitt v. Siems</i> , 130 Nev. 503, 509, 330 P.3d. 1, 5, (2014)	1, 5, 8
<i>Lentz v. Boles</i> , 84 Nev. 197, 200, 438 P.2d 254, 256 – 57 (1968)	4
<i>Lofthouse v. State</i> , 136 Nev. Adv. Rep. 44, 467 P.3d 609, 611 (2020)	6
<i>McLellan vs. State</i> , 124 Nev. 263, 267 (Nev. 2008)	5
<i>M.G. Multi-Family Dev., LLC v. Crestdale Assocs., Ltd.</i> , 124 Nev. 901, 912, 193 P.3d 536, 544 (2008)	1
<i>Rivero v. Rivero</i> , 125 Nev. 410, 438, 216 P.3d 213, 232 (2009)	8, 11, and 13
<i>Young v. Johnny Ribeiro Building</i> , 106 Nev. 88, 787 P.2d 777 (1990)	16
<i>Waldman v. Miani</i> , 124 Nev. 1121, 1136 – 1137, 195 P.3d 850 (2008)	6
<i>Williams v. Williams</i> , 120 Nev. 559, 566, 97 P.3d 1124, 1129 (2004)	8
<i>Wolff v. Wolff</i> , 112 Nev. 1355, 1359, 929 P.2d 916, 918-19 (1996)	5, 9, 12, and 13
STATUTES	
NRS 125B.020(1)	14
NRS 125B.110	6, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 14

RULES	PAGE
NRAP 28(e)(1)	17
NRAP 30	15
NRAP 30(g)(2)	16
NRAP 32(a)	17
NRCP 16.2(e)(3)(A)	3
NRCP 16.2(e)(3)(B)	3

Respondent, Emily Reed, through her Conservator Alecia Draper (hereinafter “Emily”), by and through her attorney, submits the following answering brief.¹

References to “Emily’s App.” are to Respondent’s Appendix filed with her Answering Brief; those to “Jeff’s App” are to the appendix filed with Jeff’s Opening Brief.

ARGUMENT

THE DISTRICT COURT CORRECTLY APPLIED NEVADA LAW AND PROPERLY EXERCISED HIS DISCRETION. THE JUDGMENT SHOULD BE AFFIRMED IN ITS ENTIRETY.

1. ISSUE#1: THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ERR IN NOT FINDING GOOD CAUSE TO EXTEND DISCOVERY, EXTEND TIME FOR REBUTTAL EXPERT AND CONTINUE THE TRIAL.

This court reviews a district court’s ruling to exclude expert testimony for an abuse of discretion. *Leavitt v. Siems*, 130 Nev. 503, 509, 330 P.3d. 1, 5, (2014). Absent a showing of “palpable abuse,” this court will not interfere with a district court’s exercise of its discretion. *M.G. Multi-Family Dev., LLC v. Crestdale Assocs., Ltd.*, 124 Nev. 901, 912, 193 P.3d 536, 544 (2008). A palpable abuse of discretion occurs only if “no reasonable judge could reach a similar conclusion under the same circumstances.” *Leavitt*, 130 Nev. at 509, 330 P.3d at 5.

¹ This Errata Respondent’s Answering Brief is submitted because it was discovered that the original brief that was e-filed was not in final form and did not contain the authorities and table of contents and authorities, which have been corrected in this Errata.

The district court judge properly exercised his discretion in denying Jeff's Motion.

This case involves only one expert, Emily's expert and treating psychiatrist Dr. Love. The reason for this is that **Jeff NEVER identified or disclosed a rebuttal expert witness and NEVER produced a rebuttal expert report**. In fact, Jeff **never even RETAINED a Rebuttal Expert!**

Long after the expert deadline, on the eve of the Evidentiary Hearing, Jeff filed a motion to extend discovery, extend time for rebuttal expert, and to continue the trial. Jeff App Vol 4 ROA0655 – 0672. Emily filed an Opposition to Jeff's Motion. Jeff App Vol 4 ROA0677 – 0690.

No good cause existed for the granting of Jeff's motion for numerous reasons, including the following:

First, the request for post-majority child support for Emily as a disabled child had been pending since 2017.

Second, Jeff never Disclosed the **Identity** of Any Rebuttal Expert. Jeff App Vol 4 ROA0677 – 0690.

Third, in 2017, Emily disclosed the identity of her expert, Dr. Love (also known as Dr. Farrell or Dr. Love Farrell). Emily App Vol 11, RA 2459 – 2467.

Dr. Love Farrell's Initial Expert Report was provided to Jeff on August 31, 2017 (Emily App Vol 11, RA 2461) and again on July 29, 2019 (Emily App Vol

11, RA 2460, 2461 and 2462). On October 22, 2019, Jeff was provided with Dr. Love's CV. Emily App Vol 11, RA 2459 – 2467.

On December 4, 2019, Emily provided Jeff with Dr. Love Farrell's Supplemental Report. Emily App Vol 11, RA 2464.

Pursuant to NRCP 16.2(e)(3)(A) a party must disclose the identity of their rebuttal expert within 21 days after the disclosure made by the other party. Jeff never disclosed the identity of any rebuttal expert.

Pursuant to NRCP 16.2(e)(3)(B), a party must deliver their expert report to the opposing party within 60 days of the close of discovery. **Discovery closed in this case on April 2, 2020. Jeff's Rebuttal Expert Report was due on February 3, 2020. Jeff never produced any Rebuttal Expert Report.** Jeff never filed a motion seeking an extension of the rebuttal deadlines before the February 3, 2020 rebuttal expert report deadline.

Emily timely responded to all written discovery back in July of 2019. Jeff App Vol 4 ROA0677 – 0690. Jeff never filed a motion to compel or indicated that any responses were insufficient. Jeff App Vol 4 ROA0677 – 0690.

Contrary to Jeff's motion, ALL of Emily's medical records that Alecia had requested over the years and deemed necessary for this case had been provided to Jeff, as they became available. Emily's App Vol 22 RA 2459 – 2467. In fact, Jeff had Emily's medical records for treatment rendered to her while she was a minor

since August 31, 2017 (Bates# PL 000001 – 000267). Emily's App Vol 22 RA 2459 – 2467. This included a Summary of Emily's Medical Treatment, with the names of her medical providers (Bates# PL 000257 – 000267). Emily's App Vol 22 RA 2459 – 2467.

In addition, Emily had provided Jeff with two HIPPA Releases authorizing him to get Emily's medical records, Trial Exhibit K (valid thru 11/16/17) and Trial Exhibit L (valid thru 11/16/20). Emily's App Vol 11 RAS 2468 – 2471.

Dr. Love provided ALL of the documents and medical records that she reviewed in reaching her expert opinions in this case. Emily's App Vol 11 RA 2459 – 2468. See also Dr. Love's testimony. Jeff's App Vol 15 (Day 2) ROA 2730 – 2731. See also Jeff App Vol 4 ROA0677 – 0690.

Emily never FAILED to timely provide any documents to Jeff! As can be seen from Trial Exhibit 86, Emily provided documents as they became available and supplemented her disclosure multiple times including (1) August 31, 2017 (2) July 29, 2019 (3) October 22, 2019 (4) December 4, 2019 (5) January 31, 2020, and (6) April 2, 2020. Emily's App Vol 11 RAS 2459 – 2466.

Despite having two HIPPA Releases, Jeff NEVER requested or produced any of Emily's medical records. Jeff App Vol 4 ROA0677 – 0690. See also Jeff's testimony. Jeff's App (Day 3) Vol 16 ROA 2796.

Nevada's policy in favor of resolving cases on the merits, does not permit litigants to "disregard process or procedural rules with impunity." *Lentz v. Boles*, 84 Nev. 197, 200, 438 P.2d 254, 256 – 57 (1968).

Given the foregoing, the District Court acted well within his discretion to deny Jeff's motion.

2. ISSUE #2: THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ERR IN REFUSING TO ALLOW JEFF TO RE-CALL EMILY AS A WITNESS.

The district court's decision to admit or exclude evidence is reviewed for an abuse of discretion. *McLellan vs. State*, 124 Nev. 263, 267 (Nev. 2008). "An abuse of discretion occurs when no reasonable judge could reach a similar conclusion under the same circumstances." *Leavitt v. Siems*, 130 Nev. 503, 509, 330 P.3d 1, 5 (2014).

Absent an abuse of discretion, this court does not "reweigh evidence" on appeal. See *Wolff v. Wolff*, 112 Nev. 1355, 1359, 929 P.2d 916, 918-19 (1996).

"This court defers to a district court's findings of fact and will only disturb them if they are not supported by substantial evidence." *Klavacka v. Nelson*, 133 Nev. 164, 175, 394 P.3d 940, 949 (2017).

The District Judge did not abuse his discretion in denying Jeff's request to RE-CALL Emily a second time. The court allowed counsel for all parties to question Emily during the trial. See Emily's testimony in Jeff's App Vol 15 (Day 2) ROA 2745 – 2771. Emily is under a conservatorship because of her disability.

Trial Exhibit 21. Emily's App RA 1091 – 1094. Emily appeared thru various alters during her trial testimony that were very young in age. Jeff's App Vol 15 (Day 2) ROA 2745 – 2771. Any additional testimony the Court felt would be cumulative, irrelevant, and unnecessary to his decision. Jeff's App (Day 4) Vol 16 ROA 2929 - 2930 and Vol 16 ROA 2980 - 2985.

3. ISSUE #3: THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ERR IN ALLOWING EMILY TO RAISE CLAIMS OF POST-MAJORITY SUPPORT AFTER SHE REACHED MAJORITY.

This court reviews questions of law, such as statutory interpretation, de novo, but defers to the district court's factual findings. *Waldman v. Miani*, 124 Nev. 1121, 1136 – 1137, 195 P.3d 850 (2008). See also, *Klabacka v. Nelson*, 133 Nev. 164, 175, 394 P.3d 940, 949 (2017).

“When interpreting a statute, this court looks first to the statute's plain language and, only if it finds an ambiguity, will it look beyond the language to determine legislative intent. If the court finds an ambiguity, it looks to the statute's context to effectuate the legislative intent behind the statute.” *Waldman v. Miani*, 124 Nev. 1121, 1136 – 1137, 195 P.3d 850 (2008).

“When interpreting a statute, we **focus on** the **words used** in the statute. See *Blackburn v. State*, 129 Nev 92, 95, 294 P.3d 422, 425 (2013)(“**Our analysis begins and ends with the statutory text** if it is clear and unambiguous)” *Lofthouse v. State*, 136 Nev. Adv. Rep. 44, 467 P.3d 609, 611 (2020).(Emphasis supplied.)

NRS 125B.110 (Support of Child with Handicap Beyond Age of Majority)

states the following:

1. A parent shall support beyond the age of majority his or her child with a handicap until the child is no longer handicapped or until the child becomes self-supporting. The handicap of the child must have occurred before the age of majority for this duty to apply.
2. For the purposes of this section, a child is self-supporting if the child receives public assistance beyond the age of majority and that assistance is sufficient to meet the child's needs.
3. This section does not impair or otherwise affect the eligibility of a person with a handicap to receive benefits from a source other than his or her parents.
4. As used in this section, "handicap" means an inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.

A focus on WORDS USED in the above statute reveals that the "handicap" of the child "must have occurred before the age of majority" for this duty to apply; however, there are NO WORDS anywhere in the statute that say the claim for support must be "filed" before the age of majority!

This Court has no authority to ADD words into this statute that do not exist!

The District Court correctly held that Emily can bring a claim post-majority.

The District Court correctly concluded that "NRS 125B.110 authorizes a court to obligate either or both parents to support his or her handicapped child for an

indefinite period, even if that child has reached the age of majority.” Jeff’s App Vol 3, ROA 3026.

The district court correctly stated that “NRS 125B.110 was designed for the **benefit of the disabled adult child**. The statute is designed to require parents to bear some of the financial burden for the support of their disabled child.” Jeff’s App Vol 3, ROA 505. As a result, the court held that Emily **has a right** to bring her own action for support from her parents post-majority. Jeff’s App Vol 3, ROA 512.

Nothing in the statute requires bringing the claim before the child reaches the age of majority. The Court’s ruling is correct and should be affirmed.

4. ISSUE #4: THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ERR IN RELYING UPON A DIAGNOSIS OF DISASSOCIATED IDENTITY DISORDER AFTER EMILY REACHED THE AGE OF MAJORITY AND GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL AS PART OF HIS DETERMINATION THAT EMILY IS HANDICAPPED.

“This court reviews the district court’s decisions regarding child support for an abuse of discretion.” *Rivero v. Rivero*, 125 Nev. 410, 438, 216 P.3d 213, 232 (2009). “An abuse of discretion occurs when no reasonable judge could reach a similar conclusion under the same circumstances.” *Leavitt v. Siems*, 130 Nev. 503, 509, 330 P.3d 1, 5 (2014).

“Rulings supported by substantial evidence will not be disturbed on appeal.” *Williams v. Williams*, 120 Nev. 559, 566, 97 P.3d 1124, 1129 (2004) (internal quotation marks omitted). Substantial evidence is “evidence that a reasonable

person may accept as adequate to sustain a judgment.” *Rivera*, 125 Nev. at 428, 216 P.3d at 226 (quoting *Ellis v. Carucci*, 123 Nev. 145, 149, 161 P.3d 239, 242 (2007)).

Absent an abuse of discretion, this court does not “reweigh evidence” on appeal. See *Wolff v. Wolff*, 112 Nev. 1355, 1359, 929 P.2d 916, 918-19 (1996).

“This court defers to a district court’s findings of fact and will only disturb them if they are not supported by substantial evidence.” *Klavacka v. Nelson*, 133 Nev. 164, 175, 394 P.3d 940, 949 (2017).

NRS 125B.110(1) reads “[a] parent shall support beyond the age of majority his or her child with a handicap until the child is no longer handicapped or until the child becomes self-supporting.” (Emphasis supplied).

The District Court did NOT abuse his discretion in this case.

NRS 125B.110 provides the statutory requirement for parents to support their child beyond the age of majority as long as the statutory requirements are met. **The evidence presented at the Evidentiary Hearing was substantial and overwhelmingly established that all of the statutory requirements have been met.** This evidence includes, but is not limited to the following:

- a) The testimony of Emily and her multiple alters/personalities; Jeff’s App Vol 15 (Day 2) ROA 2745 – 2771.
- b) The testimony of Alecia. Emily’s App Vol 1 (Day 1) and Jeff’s App

Vol 16 (Day 3 and Day 4);

- c) The testimony of Dr. Love, who is Emily's treating psychiatrist and the only Expert Witness in this case, as well as her Expert Report, Supplemental Expert Report, and her treatment records. Emily's App Vol 1 (Day 1) and Jeff's App Vol 15 (Day 2). See Trial Exhibits 13; Trial Exhibit 14, Trial Exhibit 15, Trial Exhibit 16, Trial Exhibit 17, Trial Exhibit 18, and Trial 19, all in Emily's App Vol 3 RA 0677 – Vol 5 RA 1090;
- d) Emily's Nevada School Records. Trial Exhibit 1. Emily's App Vol 2 RA 0267 - 0332.
- e) Emily's California School Records. Trial Exhibit 2; Emily's App Vol 2 RA 0333 - 0422.
- f) Emily's Social Security Records. Trial Exhibit 9, Emily's App Vol 3 RA0615 - 0650.
- g) Emily's Medical Records. Trial Exhibit 5 and Trial Exhibit 6 (for treatment before age 18)(Emily's App Vol 2 RA 0423 – Vol 3 RA 0614) as well as Trial Exhibit 11 (Emily's App Vol 3 RA 0651 – 0676), Trial Exhibit Trial Exhibit 25, Trial Exhibit 26, Trial Exhibit 27, Trial Exhibit 28, Trial Exhibit 33, Trial Exhibit 35, Trial Exhibit 36, Trial Exhibit 37, Trial Exhibit 38, Trial Exhibit 39, Trial Exhibit

40 (Emily's App Vol 5 RA 1095 – Vol 8 RA 1734) as well as Dr. Love's records set forth above in subsection (c). See Emily's Medical History List, Exhibit 42. Emily's App Vol 8 RA 1735 – 1747.

h) The letters of Conservatorship for Emily. Trial Exhibit 21, Emily's App Vol 5 RA 1091 - 1094.

It is undisputed that Emily was sexually abused as a minor for over 8 years by Defendant's roommate from 2005 until February of 2014. Alecia's Testimony, Emily's App Vol 1 (Day 1) and Jeff's Testimony, Jeff's App (Day 3) Vol 16 ROA 2798.

Dr. Love testified that it is her professional opinion that Emily became disabled prior to age 18 and remains disabled to this date. Dr. Love explained that Emily suffers from Major Depressive Disorder (recurrent and severe); Chronic Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (which is regularly suicidal); and Dissociative Identity Disorder (which is characterized by multiple personalities). Dr. Love explained that Emily's behavior has become so erratic and potentially dangerous that Dr. Love had to place her mom, Alecia, on FMLA leave in order to care for Emily. Dr. Love testified that it is her professional opinion that Emily has been disabled under NRS 125B.110 since before the age of majority; that Emily is handicapped under the statute; and that Emily is unable to be self-supporting. Dr. Love explained that Emily is **unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity** by reason of her

significant and chronic mental impairment, which has lasted for many years and is expected to last for a period of over 12 months. See Dr. Love’s entire testimony, which is critical to this case (Emily’s App Vol 1 and Jeff’s App Vol 15) and both of Dr. Love’s expert reports (Exhibit 13 & 14, Emily’s App Vol 3 RA 0677 – 0702).

Jeff failed to provide ANY rebuttal expert testimony to counter Dr. Love’s opinions.

5. ISSUE #5: THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ERR IN DETERMINING THAT EMILY IS NOT SELF-SUPPORTING.

“This court reviews the district court’s decisions regarding child support for an abuse of discretion.” *Rivero v. Rivero*, 125 Nev. 410, 438, 216 P.3d 213, 232 (2009).

Absent an abuse of discretion, this court does not “reweigh evidence” on appeal. See *Wolff v. Wolff*, 112 Nev. 1355, 1359, 929 P.2d 916, 918-19 (1996).

“This court defers to a district court’s findings of fact and will only disturb them if they are not supported by substantial evidence.” *Klavacka v. Nelson*, 133 Nev. 164, 175, 394 P.3d 940, 949 (2017).

The District Judge did NOT abuse his discretion.

The documentary evidence presented at trial clearly shows that Emily is not self- supporting! Emily presented proof of her actual income and expenses for the

years 2017 (when the motion was filed) through 2019² and 2020,³ which reveal that Emily is SHORT every month as shown below:

2020 Deficit: -\$3,294.88/month Emily's App Vol 11, RA 2445-2447

2019 Deficit: - \$3,493.18/month Emily's App Vol 11, RA 2431

2018 Deficit: - \$2,721.06/month Emily's App Vol 11, RA 2431

2017 Deficit: - \$2,158.44/month Emily's App Vol 11, RA 2431

The fact that Emily is disabled and not self-supporting is clearly supported by the testimony of Alecia as well as the testimony of Dr. Love.

The argument in Jeff's brief about what Jeff's counsel thinks is reasonable or not reasonable is irrelevant! Dr. Love testified that it is her professional opinion that Emily has been disabled under NRS 125B.110 **since before the age of majority;** that Emily is **handicapped under the statute;** and that Emily is **unable to be self-supporting.** Dr. Love explained that Emily is **unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity** by reason of her **significant and chronic mental impairment,**

² A summary of Emily's actual Income and Expenses for the years 2017, 2018, and 2019 is contained in Trial Exhibit 82. Emily's App Vol 11, RA 2431. The backup to support for all years is contained in Exhibit 51 – Exhibit 78 in Emily's App Vol 8 - 11.

³ Emily's actual 2020 Income and Expenses are set forth in her Updated Financial Disclosure Form, Trial Exhibit 85. Emily's App Vol 11, RA 2443 – 2458.

which has lasted for many years and is expected to last for a period of over 12 months.

Jeff failed to provide ANY rebuttal expert testimony to counter Dr. Love's opinions.

6. ISSUE #6: THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ERR IN GRANTING CONSTRUCTIVE POST MAJORITY SUPPORT.

"This court reviews the district court's decisions regarding child support for an abuse of discretion." *Rivero v. Rivero*, 125 Nev. 410, 438, 216 P.3d 213, 232 (2009).

Absent an abuse of discretion, this court does not "reweigh evidence" on appeal. See *Wolff v. Wolff*, 112 Nev. 1355, 1359, 929 P.2d 916, 918-19 (1996).

"This court defers to a district court's findings of fact and will only disturb them if they are not supported by substantial evidence." *Klavacka v. Nelson*, 133 Nev. 164, 175, 394 P.3d 940, 949 (2017).

The District Court properly exercised his discretion.

NRS 125B.020(1)(Obligation of parents) provide as follows: The parents of a child have a duty to provide the child necessary maintenance, health care, education and support.

This is a case by Emily for continued child support post-majority against both of Emily's parents due to Emily's disability and handicapped status under NRS 125B.110, Nevada's Handicap Child Support Statute.

On June 29, 2017, Jeff filed a Motion to Reset Child Support Based Upon Emancipation of a Child. Jeff's App Vol 1, ROA 062 – 0074. In Response, **on July 21, 2017**, Alecia filed an Opposition and Countermotion for Support of Disabled Child. Jeff's App Vol 2, ROA 00096 – 0330. After motion practice, on May 22, 2018, the district judge ordered that Emily, through her conservator, must be joined as a party in this case or file a separate action. Jeff's App Vol 3, ROA 0501 – 0516 at ROA0515.

On January 22, 2019, Emily, through her conservator, filed Motion for Child Support For a Disabled Child Beyond the Age of Majority. Jeff's App Vol 4, ROA 0536 – 0549. In addition, also on January 22, 2019, Emily, through her conservator, filed a Notice of Joinder in the Countermotion for Child Support for Disabled Child filed by Alecia back on July 21, 2017. Jeff's App Vol 3, ROA0535. Thereafter, on April 10, 2019, Emily, through her conservator, filed a First Amended Motion (as Conservator for Emily) for Child Support Beyond the Age of Majority. Jeff's App Vol 4, ROA 0581 – 0584.

Given the foregoing, it was well within the District Court's discretion to make the child support order effective retroactive to the 2017 filing date.

CONCLUSION

As shown herein, it is clear that the district court Judge properly applied Nevada law in all respects, on all issues; thus, the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of

Law, and Order at issue signed Judge Ritchie on January 28, 2021 should be AFFIRMED in its entirety.

Jeff's Appendix is incomplete and not in compliance with NRAP 30. As a result of the significant deficiencies in Jeff's Appendix, Emily's counsel (who is a solo practitioner) was forced to file an eleven volume appendix to provide the Court with the proper and necessary documents. This took a considerable amount of time and expense for Emily's counsel, all of which should have been done by Jeff's counsel! For example, Emily's Appendix contains the CORRECT trial transcript for the first day of the trial August 6, 2020 ("Trial Day 1"). Emily's App Vol 1 RA 0004 – Vol 2 RA 0266. In contrast, Jeff included an outdated transcript for Trial Day 1 which contains errors that the court reporter subsequently corrected. Jeff's App Vol 5 ROA0593 – Vol 6 ROA1108. In addition, Jeff DELETED the original bates numbers from almost all of the trial exhibits; requiring Emily to submit an appendix with "true and correct" copies of the exhibits submitted at the trial. Emily's App Vol 1 RA 0267 – Vol 11 RA2471. The Court is asked to note these apparently intentional, tactical omissions, and impose sanctions against Jeff and/or his counsel pursuant to NRAP 30(g)(2). *See also Young v. Johnny Ribeiro Building*, 106 Nev. 88, 787 P.2d777 (1990).

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Elizabeth Brennan
ELIZABETH BRENNAN

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using 14 point Times New Roman in Word format.

I further certify that this brief complies with the page- or type- volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by NRAP 32(a)(7)(C), it is proportionately spaced, has typeface of 14 points or more and does not exceed 30 pages.

Finally, I hereby certify that I have read this appellate brief, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I further certify that this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e)(1), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by a reference to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where the matter relied on is to be found. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Dated this 11th day of January, 2022.

/s/ Elizabeth Brennan

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The foregoing **Respondent's Answering Brief** (Errata) in the above-captioned case was served this date by mailing a true and correct copy thereof, via first class, postage prepaid and addressed as follows **and** by electronic service through the Court's electronic filing system:

Amanda M. Roberts, Esq.
Roberts Stoffel Family Law Group
Attorney for Appellant
4411 S. Pecos Road
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121

Clerk, Nevada Supreme Court
201 S. Carson Street, Suite 201
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Dated this 11th day of January, 2022.

/s/ Elizabeth Brennan
an employee of Brennan Law Firm