

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

INDICATE FULL CAPTION:

MINH NGUYET LUONG,
Appellant,

vs.

JAMES VAHEY,
Respondent.

No. 83098

Electronically Filed
Jul 19 2021 12:48 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court
**DOCKETING STATEMENT
CIVIL APPEALS**

GENERAL INFORMATION

Appellants must complete this docketing statement in compliance with NRAP 14(a). The purpose of the docketing statement is to assist the Supreme Court in screening jurisdiction, identifying issues on appeal, assessing presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, scheduling cases for oral argument and settlement conferences, classifying cases for expedited treatment and assignment to the Court of Appeals, and compiling statistical information.

WARNING

This statement must be completed fully, accurately and on time. NRAP 14(c). The Supreme Court may impose sanctions on counsel or appellant if it appears that the information provided is incomplete or inaccurate. *Id.* Failure to fill out the statement completely or to file it in a timely manner constitutes grounds for the imposition of sanctions, including a fine and/or dismissal of the appeal.

A complete list of the documents that must be attached appears as Question 27 on this docketing statement. Failure to attach all required documents will result in the delay of your appeal and may result in the imposition of sanctions.

This court has noted that when attorneys do not take seriously their obligations under NRAP 14 to complete the docketing statement properly and conscientiously, they waste the valuable judicial resources of this court, making the imposition of sanctions appropriate. See KDI Sylvan Pools v. Workman, 107 Nev. 340, 344, 810 P.2d 1217, 1220 (1991). Please use tab dividers to separate any attached documents.

1. Judicial District Eighth Department U
County Clark Judge Hon. Dawn Throne
District Ct. Case No. D-18-581444-D

2. Attorney filing this docketing statement:

Attorney Fred Page, Esq. Telephone (702) 823-2888

Firm Page Law Firm

Address 6930 South Cimarron Road, Suite 140
Las Vegas, Nevada 89113

Client(s) Minh Nguyet Luong

If this is a joint statement by multiple appellants, add the names and addresses of other counsel and the names of their clients on an additional sheet accompanied by a certification that they concur in the filing of this statement.

3. Attorney(s) representing respondents(s):

Attorney Robert Dickerson, Esq. Telephone (702) 388-8600

Firm Dickerson-Karacsonyi Law Group

Address 1745 Village Center Circle
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Client(s) James Vahey

Attorney Sabrina Dolson, Esq. Telephone (702) 388-8600

Firm Dickerson-Karacsonyi Law Group

Address 1745 Village Center Circle
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Client(s) James Vahey

(List additional counsel on separate sheet if necessary)

4. Nature of disposition below (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment after bench trial | <input type="checkbox"/> Dismissal: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment after jury verdict | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of jurisdiction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Summary judgment | <input type="checkbox"/> Failure to state a claim |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Default judgment | <input type="checkbox"/> Failure to prosecute |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of injunction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Divorce Decree: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of declaratory relief | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Modification |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review of agency determination | <input type="checkbox"/> Other disposition (specify): _____ |

5. Does this appeal raise issues concerning any of the following?

- ☐ Child Custody
- ☐ Venue
- ☐ Termination of parental rights

6. Pending and prior proceedings in this court. List the case name and docket number of all appeals or original proceedings presently or previously pending before this court which are related to this appeal:

Not applicable.

7. Pending and prior proceedings in other courts. List the case name, number and court of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts which are related to this appeal (e.g., bankruptcy, consolidated or bifurcated proceedings) and their dates of disposition:

Not applicable.

8. Nature of the action. Briefly describe the nature of the action and the result below:

The nature of the action is a Motion filed to Enter the Decree of Divorce that was filed on February 11, 2021. In the Motion, in addition to requesting that the Decree of Divorce be entered, it was requested of the district court judge that she resolve two items that were still unadjudicated, health insurance premiums and who conducts the transportation for custody exchanges, that she modify an Order that was entered during the pendency of the divorce that both parties be permitted to have unfettered telephone contact. The district court agreed that both parties could cover the minor children under their respective insurance policies, ordered that Minh provide 100 percent of the transportation for the custody exchanges, and limited Minh's ability to freely contact the minor children during Jim's custodial time.

9. Issues on appeal. State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal (attach separate sheets as necessary):

Whether the district court conducted the proper analysis in requiring the Minh perform 100 percent of the transportation for the custodial exchanges.

Whether the district court conducted the proper analysis in limiting the ability of both parents to contact the children when during the other parents' custodial time.

10. Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues. If you are aware of any proceedings presently pending before this court which raises the same or similar issues raised in this appeal, list the case name and docket numbers and identify the same or similar issue raised:

None.

11. Constitutional issues. If this appeal challenges the constitutionality of a statute, and the state, any state agency, or any officer or employee thereof is not a party to this appeal, have you notified the clerk of this court and the attorney general in accordance with NRAP 44 and NRS 30.130?

☒ N/A

☐ Yes

☐ No

If not, explain:

12. Other issues. Does this appeal involve any of the following issues?

☐ Reversal of well-settled Nevada precedent (identify the case(s))

☐ An issue arising under the United States and/or Nevada Constitutions

☒ A substantial issue of first impression

☐ An issue of public policy

☐ An issue where en banc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of this court's decisions

☐ A ballot question

If so, explain: It is a substantial issue of first impression as to what analysis a district court should undertake in determining responsibility for who conducts transportation for visitation or custodial exchanges.

13. Assignment to the Court of Appeals or retention in the Supreme Court. Briefly set forth whether the matter is presumptively retained by the Supreme Court or assigned to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, and cite the subparagraph(s) of the Rule under which the matter falls. If appellant believes that the Supreme Court should retain the case despite its presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals, identify the specific issue(s) or circumstance(s) that warrant retaining the case, and include an explanation of their importance or significance:

The case is presumptively assigned to the Court of Appeal under NRAP 17. The case should be retained by the Supreme Court as the case involves a substantial and important issue of what type of analysis district courts should engage in when determining the allocation of transportation responsibilities for visitation and custodial exchanges.

14. Trial. If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last? 3 days

Was it a bench or jury trial? Bench

15. Judicial Disqualification. Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from participation in this appeal? If so, which Justice?

No.

TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

16. Date of entry of written judgment or order appealed from May 19, 2021

If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review:

Not applicable.

17. Date written notice of entry of judgment or order was served May 19, 2021

Was service by:

☐ Delivery

☒ Mail/electronic/fax

18. If the time for filing the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion (NRCP 50(b), 52(b), or 59)

(a) Specify the type of motion, the date and method of service of the motion, and the date of filing.

☐ NRCP 50(b) Date of filing Not applicable

☐ NRCP 52(b) Date of filing Not applicable

☐ NRCP 59 Date of filing Not applicable

NOTE: Motions made pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration may toll the time for filing a notice of appeal. See AA Primo Builders v. Washington, 126 Nev. ___, 245 P.3d 1190 (2010).

(b) Date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion Not applicable

(c) Date written notice of entry of order resolving tolling motion was served N/A

Was service by:

☐ Delivery

☐ Mail

19. Date notice of appeal filed June 14, 2021

If more than one party has appealed from the judgment or order, list the date each notice of appeal was filed and identify by name the party filing the notice of appeal:

Not applicable.

20. Specify statute or rule governing the time limit for filing the notice of appeal, e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other

NRAP 4(a)

SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY

21. Specify the statute or other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review the judgment or order appealed from:

(a)

☒ NRAP 3A(b)(1)

☐ NRS 38.205

☐ NRAP 3A(b)(2)

☐ NRS 233B.150

☐ NRAP 3A(b)(3)

☐ NRS 703.376

☐ Other (specify) _____

(b) Explain how each authority provides a basis for appeal from the judgment or order:

The Order appealed from is a final order.

22. List all parties involved in the action or consolidated actions in the district court:

(a) Parties:

Minh Nguyet Luong - Appellant

James Vahey - Respondent

(b) If all parties in the district court are not parties to this appeal, explain in detail why those parties are not involved in this appeal, *e.g.*, formally dismissed, not served, or other:

Not Applicable

23. Give a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate claims, counterclaims, cross-claims, or third-party claims and the date of formal disposition of each claim.

The action was for a divorce. The formal disposition of the claims on appeal was on May 19, 2021

24. Did the judgment or order appealed from adjudicate ALL the claims alleged below and the rights and liabilities of ALL the parties to the action or consolidated actions below?

☒ Yes

☐ No

25. If you answered "No" to question 24, complete the following:

(a) Specify the claims remaining pending below:

Not applicable.

(b) Specify the parties remaining below:

Not applicable.

(c) Did the district court certify the judgment or order appealed from as a final judgment pursuant to NRCP 54(b)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

(d) Did the district court make an express determination, pursuant to NRCP 54(b), that there is no just reason for delay and an express direction for the entry of judgment?

☐ Yes

☒ No

26. If you answered "No" to any part of question 25, explain the basis for seeking appellate review (e.g., order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)):

The Order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b).

27. Attach file-stamped copies of the following documents:

- The latest-filed complaint, counterclaims, cross-claims, and third-party claims
- Any tolling motion(s) and order(s) resolving tolling motion(s)
- Orders of NRCP 41(a) dismissals formally resolving each claim, counterclaims, cross-claims and/or third-party claims asserted in the action or consolidated action below, even if not at issue on appeal
- Any other order challenged on appeal
- Notices of entry for each attached order


VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read this docketing statement, that the information provided in this docketing statement is true and complete to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I have attached all required documents to this docketing statement.

Minh Nguyet Luong
Name of appellant

Fred Page, Esq.
Name of counsel of record

July 19, 2021
Date


Signature of counsel of record

Nevada, Clark County
State and county where signed

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I certify that on the 19th day of July, 2021, I served a copy of this completed docketing statement upon all counsel of record:

- ☐ By personally serving it upon him/her; or
- ☒ By mailing it by first class mail with sufficient postage prepaid to the following address(es): (NOTE: If all names and addresses cannot fit below, please list names below and attach a separate sheet with the addresses.)

Robert Dickerson, Esq.
Sabrina Dolson, Esq.
Dickerson-Karacsonyi Law Group
1745 Village Center Circle
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Dated this 19th day of July, 2021


Signature



1 NEOJ
2 THE DICKERSON KARACSONYI LAW GROUP
3 ROBERT P. DICKERSON, ESQ.
4 Nevada Bar No. 000945
5 SABRINA M. DOLSON, ESQ.
6 Nevada Bar No. 013105
7 1745 Village Center Circle
8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
9 Telephone: (702) 388-8600
10 Facsimile: (702) 388-0210
11 Email: info@thedklawgroup.com

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff

13 DISTRICT COURT
14 FAMILY DIVISION

15 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

16 JAMES W. VAHEY,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 MINH NGUYET LUONG,

20 Defendant.

21 CASE NO.: D-18-581444-D
22 DEPT NO.: U

23 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER FROM APRIL 13, 2021
24 HEARING AND APRIL 28, 2021 MINUTE ORDER

25 TO: MINH NGUYET LUONG, Defendant; and

26 TO: FRED PAGE, ESQ. of PAGE LAW FIRM, Attorney for Defendant:

27 ...

28 ...

...

...

...

...

...

...

1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an ORDER FROM APRIL 13, 2021
2 HEARING AND APRIL 28, 2021 MINUTE ORDER, a true and correct
3 copy of which is attached hereto, was entered in the above-entitled matter
4 on the 18th day of May, 2021.

5 DATED this 19th day of May, 2021.

6 THE DICKERSON KARACSONYI
7 LAW GROUP
8

9 By /s/ Sabrina M. Dolson
10 ROBERT P. DICKERSON, ESQ.
11 Nevada Bar No. 000945
12 SABRINA M. DOLSON, ESQ.
13 Nevada Bar No. 013105
14 1745 Village Center Circle
15 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
16 Attorneys for Plaintiff
17
18
19
20
21
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
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

☒ pursuant to NRCP 5(b)(2)(E) by mandatory electronic service through the Eighth Judicial District Court's electronic filing system;

☐ by placing same to be deposited for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was prepaid in Las Vegas, Nevada;

☐ to be sent via facsimile, by duly executed consent for service by electronic means

☐ by hand-delivery with signed Receipt of Copy.

FRED PAGE, ESQ.
PAGE LAW FIRM
6930 South Cimarron Road, Suite 140
Las Vegas, Nevada 89113
fpage@pagelawoffices.com
Attorney for Defendant

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDR

THE DICKERSON KARACSONYI LAW GROUP
ROBERT P. DICKERSON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 000945
SABRINA M. DOLSON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 013105
1745 Village Center Circle
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Telephone: (702) 388-8600
Facsimile: (702) 388-0210
Email: info@thedklawgroup.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DISTRICT COURT
FAMILY DIVISION
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES W. VAHEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

MINH NGUYET LUONG,

Defendant.

CASE NO. D-18-581444-D
DEPT NO. U

ORDER FROM APRIL 13, 2021 HEARING AND APRIL 28, 2021 MINUTE ORDER

This matter having come before the Honorable Judge Dawn R. Throne, on the 13th day of April, 2021, for a Return Hearing on Plaintiff's Brief for April 13, 2021 Hearing ("Plaintiff's Brief"), and Defendant's Brief Regarding Outstanding Issues ("Defendant's Brief"). JAMES W. VAHEY ("Jim"), appearing telephonically with his attorney, SABRINA M. DOLSON, ESQ., of THE DICKERSON KARACSONYI LAW GROUP, present via Blue Jeans, and Defendant, MINH NGUYET LUONG ("Minh"), present via

1 Blue Jeans with her attorney, FRED PAGE, ESQ., of PAGE LAW FIRM. The
2 Court also took the issue of health insurance coverage for the minor
3 children under submission and placed a hearing on the Chambers Calendar
4 for April 27, 2021 to consider Document Filed Pursuant to Court Order:
5 Plaintiff's United Healthcare Insurance Policy Summary of Benefits
6 and Coverage and Defendant's Documents Filed Regarding Outstanding
7 Issues. The Court, having reviewed the papers and pleadings on file
8 herein, having considered the argument of each party's counsel, and
9 good cause appearing therefore, hereby FINDS and ORDERS as follows:

10 THE COURT HEREBY ADMONISHES the parties that the fighting needs
11 to stop, the parties need to be civil to each other, and the parties
12 need to put the children first. The Court further admonishes the parties
13 that if they come before the Court again regarding parenting issues,
14 a parenting coordinator may be appointed and a cooperative parenting
15 course may be ordered, to be completed together, and whomever the Court
16 believes to be the least cooperative may be responsible to pay for
17 the costs. Hearing Video, 1:48:00; 1:50:51.

18 THE COURT HEREBY FINDS that with regard to the custody exchanges,
19 Minh chose to reestablish her residence in Nevada over 35 miles from
20 where Jim resides with the children and also far away from the children's
21 current school campus. Hearing Video, 1:48:10. Based on Minh's choice
22 of the location of her residence and the fact that Minh is only working
23 part-time, Minh shall continue to be responsible for all custody
24 exchanges that do not occur at the children's school, which shall
25 continue to occur at the guard gate of Jim's community. Hearing Video,
26 1:48:10; 2:06:21.

1 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that regarding the telephone contact
2 issue, given the children's ages and the conflict between the parents,
3 daily telephone contact with the non-custodial parent is excessive.
4 Hearing Video, 1:48:38. The Court must put a limit on Minh interfering
5 with Jim's custody time, and Jim has a right to check in with the children
6 during Minh's custody weeks as well, which shall similarly be limited.
7 Hearing Video, 2:51:10. The Court recognizes that Minh is undermining
8 Jim's custody time and parenting authority, which is why the Court
9 is setting these limits. Hearing Video, 2:51:10. Thus, it is in the
10 children's best interest that the non-custodial parent may call the
11 children on Saturdays, Mondays, and Wednesdays at 7:30 p.m., and such
12 calls shall be limited to ten (10) minutes with each child. Hearing
13 Video, 1:49:00; 2:07:27. The custodial parent must answer the call
14 and the children must get on the call. Hearing Video, 1:49:10. If the
15 children want to end the call early, it is between the children and
16 the non-custodial parent. The custodial parent shall not interfere
17 with the calls. Hearing Video, 1:49:24.

18 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that it is in Hannah's best interest to
19 continue therapy sessions with Nate Minetto until Mr. Minetto
20 determines she may be exited from therapy. Hearing Video, 1:55:35.

21 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that the parties have agreed to have
22 Hannah evaluated by a psychiatrist. Hearing Video, 2:44:54. In order
23 to select that provider, Minh will select three (3) potential
24 psychiatrists to evaluate Hannah, and will provide that list to Jim.
25 Hearing Video, 2:41:12. Jim will then choose one (1) of the three (3)
26 psychiatrists and the parties have agreed to cooperate in scheduling

1 Hannah to be evaluated by the psychiatrist. Hearing Video, 2:41:12.
2 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that the solution to helping Hannah is not
3 to have her live primarily with Minh. Hearing Video, 2:45:38.

4 THE COURT FURTHER NOTES that following the April 13, 2021 hearing,
5 on April 23, 2021, both parties submitted their health insurance
6 summary policies with information regarding the benefits provided.

7 THE COURT FURTHER NOTES that the Court's decision regarding the
8 health insurance was continued and placed on the Court's chambers
9 calendar for April 27, 2021.

10 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that, after review of the health insurance
11 plan documents from both parties, Minh's private health insurance plan
12 does provide benefits similar to Jim's group health insurance plan.

13 THE COURT FURTHER NOTES that it issued a Minute Order on April
14 28, 2021 regarding the health insurance determination, which orders
15 stated therein are also set forth below.

16 NOW, THEREFORE,

17 THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS that Minh shall be responsible for all
18 custody exchanges that do not occur at the children's school, and such
19 custody exchanges shall continue to occur at the Lake Las Vegas South
20 Shore guard station. Hearing Video, 1:48:25; 2:06:21.

21 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that the non-custodial parent may call
22 the children on Saturdays, Mondays, and Wednesdays at 7:30 p.m., and
23 such calls shall be limited to ten (10) minutes with each child. Hearing
24 Video, 1:49:00; 2:07:27. The custodial parent must answer the call
25 and the children must get on the call. Hearing Video, 1:49:10. If the
26 children want to end the call early, it is between the children and

1 the non-custodial parent. The custodial parent shall not interfere
2 with the calls. Hearing Video, 1:49:24.

3 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that both parties shall complete a high
4 conflict (eight (8) or twelve (12) hour) online course and a Teen Triple
5 P (Teen Positive Parenting Program) online course provided through
6 the Parenting Project. Hearing Video, 1:50:07. THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS
7 that the parties shall file proof of completion of both courses with
8 the Court prior to filing another motion regarding child issues.
9 Hearing Video, 1:50:36. If either party files a motion without first
10 having filed proof of completion of both courses, the Court will issue
11 a Minute Order denying the motion. Hearing Video, 1:50:41.

12 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that Hannah shall continue therapy
13 sessions with Nate Minetto until Mr. Minetto determines she may be
14 exited from therapy. Hearing Video, 1:55:35.

15 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that both parties shall submit their
16 health insurance summary policies with information regarding the
17 benefits provided by April 23, 2021. Both parties did, in fact, submit
18 their health insurance summary policies with information regarding
19 the benefits provided on April 23, 2021.

20 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that the Court's decision regarding the
21 health insurance shall be continued and placed on the Court's chambers
22 calendar for April 27, 2021 at 2:00 a.m. The Court issued its Minute
23 Order regarding same on April 28, 2021.

24 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that as of January 1, 2021, both Minh
25 and Jim shall provide health insurance coverage for their three (3)
26 minor children, either through their employer or through a private

1 health insurance plan. THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that the parties should
2 be able to minimize their out-of-pocket medical expenses for their
3 minor children by using both plans through standard coordination of
4 benefits rules. THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that both parents shall
5 provide the other parent with a copy of their insurance identification
6 cards and both parents shall provide both identification cards to all
7 providers for the minor children in order to minimize the out-of-pocket
8 expenses.

9 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that in the event either parent becomes
10 unable to provide health insurance coverage for the children, they
11 shall immediately notify the other parent in writing.


12 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that during any period of time that
13 the children are only covered by one health insurance plan, the parent
14 without insurance coverage shall reimburse the parent with insurance
15 coverage for one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) of the cost to provide health insurance
16 coverage for the children only (upon providing written proof of that
17 cost) for each month that the parent is without insurance coverage.
18 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that Minh shall reimburse Jim \$1,296.00 for
19 her one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) portion of the children's health insurance for the
20 months of October, November, and December 2020 (i.e., \$432.00 per
21 month) given she did not have a health insurance policy for the children
22 during those months. Hearing Video, 2:03:01; 2:26:10.

23 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that so long as the children are covered
24 by two (2) policies, each parent shall solely pay their own insurance
25 policy costs. THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that the parents shall continue
26 to equally share any and all medical, dental, vision, orthodontic,

1 and mental health expenses for their children that are not covered
2 by their health insurance plans pursuant to the 30/30 rule already
3 set forth in the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decree of
4 Divorce, entered March 26, 2021.

5 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that the case shall be CLOSED upon entry
6 of this Order.

Dated this 18th day of May, 2021



958 B6F BC73 2006
Dawn R. Throne
District Court Judge

11 Respectfully submitted: Approved as to form and content:
12 THE DICKERSON KARACSONYI LAW GROUP PAGE LAW FIRM
13

14 /s/ Sabrina M. Dolson

15 ROBERT P. DICKERSON, ESQ.
16 Nevada Bar No. 000945
17 SABRINA M. DOLSON, ESQ.
18 Nevada Bar No. 013105
1745 Village Center Circle
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Attorneys for Plaintiff

SIGNATURE NOT PROVIDED
FRED PAGE, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 006080
6930 South Cimarron Road,
Suite 140
Las Vegas, Nevada 89113
Attorney for Defendant

1 CSERV

2 DISTRICT COURT
3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
4

5
6 James W. Vahey, Plaintiff

CASE NO: D-18-581444-D

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department U

8 Minh Nguyet Luong, Defendant.
9

10 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

11 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District
12 Court. The foregoing Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system to all
13 recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

14 Service Date: 5/18/2021

15 Sabrina Dolson

Sabrina@thedklawgroup.com

16 Robert Dickerson

Bob@thedklawgroup.com

17 Info info email

info@thedklawgroup.com

18 Fred Page

fpage@pagelawoffices.com

19 Edwardo Martinez

edwardo@thedklawgroup.com
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28