

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Electronically Filed
Aug 20 2021 03:19 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

KORI LOVETT CAGE,
Appellant(s),

vs.

MALIKA COPPEDGE,
Respondent(s),

Case No: 06R136990

Docket No: 83148

RECORD ON APPEAL VOLUME 3

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT
KORI L. CAGE, PROPER PERSON
8655 ROWLAND BLUFF AVE.
LAS VEGAS, NV 89178

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT
BRIAN E. BLACKHAM, ESQ.
725 S. 8TH ST., #100
LAS VEGAS, NV 89101

06R136990

MALIKA COPPEDGE vs. KORI L. CAGE

I N D E X

<u>VOLUME:</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER:</u>
1	1 - 240
2	241 - 480
3	481 - 687

06R136990

Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).

vs.

Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

I N D E X

<u>VOL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PLEADING</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER:</u>
1	11/30/2006	AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE	9 - 10
1	03/30/2020	APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS (CONFIDENTIAL)	140 - 142
2	01/07/2021	CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	408 - 412
2	01/08/2021	CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	424 - 425
3	06/14/2021	CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	615 - 620
3	06/28/2021	CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	641 - 645
3	06/29/2021	CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	646 - 647
3	07/07/2021	CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	658 - 659
3	06/28/2021	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	623 - 623
3	03/04/2021	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING - CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	497 - 498
3	08/20/2021	CERTIFICATION OF COPY AND TRANSMITTAL OF RECORD	
2	09/22/2020	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	304 - 306
2	10/27/2020	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	332 - 334
2	01/14/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	434 - 436
1	04/21/2008	COPY OF ORDER FROM CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2007 AND LETTER TO CONFORM	36 - 45
1	12/03/2008	COPY OF ORDER FROM DISTRICT COURT, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA DATED SEPTEMBER 25, 2008 AND LETTER TO CONFORM	54 - 61
1	08/21/2008	COPY OF ORDER FROM DISTRICT COURT, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, DATED JUNE 18, 2008 AND LETTER TO CONFORM	46 - 53
1	04/03/2020	DA RESPONSE TO OBJECTION	143 - 154
1	11/04/2019	DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S NOTICE OF MOTION & MOTION TO MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT	63 - 69

06R136990

Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).

vs.

Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

I N D E X

<u>VOL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PLEADING</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER:</u>
1	04/19/2007	DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT'S OBJECTION	21 - 28
2	01/07/2021	DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S OBJECTION AND APPEAL TO MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	393 - 407
3	08/20/2021	DISTRICT COURT MINUTES	666 - 687
1	11/26/2019	MALIKA COPPEDGE'S OPPOSITION TO DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S NOTICE OF MOTION & MOTION TO MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT AND COUNTERMOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS	70 - 81
1	01/07/2020	MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	102 - 105
1	07/10/2020	MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	206 - 210
2	09/16/2020	MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	273 - 277
2	10/13/2020	MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	314 - 317
2	11/19/2020	MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	342 - 345
3	06/11/2021	MEMORANDUM OF ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS	572 - 596
3	05/25/2021	MOTION TO RECONSIDER PETITIONERS ATTORNEY FEES AND ADOPTION OF MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OCTOBER 27, 2020 HEARING	529 - 538
3	05/04/2021	NEVADA SUPREME COURT CLERK'S CERTIFICATE/REMITTITUR JUDGMENT - DISMISSED	510 - 513
1	11/04/2006	NOTICE AND FINDING: FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY TO ENFORCE OR ADJUST AN EXISTING ORDER ESTABLISH AN OBLIGATION OR DETERMINE PATERNITY	1 - 8
2	01/07/2021	NOTICE OF APPEAL	413 - 423
3	06/14/2021	NOTICE OF APPEAL	597 - 614
3	06/28/2021	NOTICE OF APPEAL	624 - 640

06R136990

Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).

vs.

Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

I N D E X

<u>VOL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PLEADING</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER:</u>
2	09/22/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	307 - 313
2	10/27/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	325 - 331
2	10/27/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION	335 - 341
1	12/13/2019	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS	82 - 83
1	03/17/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS	106 - 112
1	07/06/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS	199 - 205
3	05/11/2021	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER	514 - 528
3	07/15/2021	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER	664 - 665
3	07/02/2021	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER RE: AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS TO PETITIONER	652 - 657
1	03/11/2008	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER/JUDGMENT	35 - 35
1	07/14/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER/JUDGMENT	211 - 216
2	09/17/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER/JUDGMENT	284 - 291
2	10/13/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER/JUDGMENT	318 - 324
2	11/30/2020	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER/JUDGMENT	382 - 388
2	01/19/2021	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER/JUDGMENT	437 - 443
1	01/05/2007	NOTICE OF HEARING	11 - 16
1	05/21/2020	NOTICE OF HEARING	189 - 189
1	06/03/2020	NOTICE OF HEARING	190 - 195
2	08/03/2020	NOTICE OF HEARING	267 - 267
2	08/03/2020	NOTICE OF HEARING	268 - 268
2	08/03/2020	NOTICE OF HEARING	269 - 269

06R136990

Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).

vs.

Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

I N D E X

<u>VOL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PLEADING</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER:</u>
2	08/03/2020	NOTICE OF HEARING	270 - 270
2	12/08/2020	NOTICE OF HEARING	391 - 391
3	05/25/2021	NOTICE OF HEARING	539 - 539
3	06/08/2021	NOTICE OF HEARING	571 - 571
1	06/25/2020	NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAR BY COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	196 - 198
2	09/14/2020	NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAR BY COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	271 - 272
2	12/03/2020	NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAR BY COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	389 - 390
1	04/03/2020	NOTICE OF INTENT/REQUEST TO APPEAR BY COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	155 - 156
1	04/13/2007	NOTICE OF MOTION	19 - 20
2	01/28/2021	NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING	466 - 467
1	07/15/2020	NOTICE OF TELEPHONIC HEARING	217 - 222
2	09/17/2020	NOTICE OF TELEPHONIC HEARING	278 - 283
2	09/17/2020	NOTICE OF TELEPHONIC HEARING	292 - 297
2	09/22/2020	NOTICE OF TELEPHONIC HEARING	298 - 303
3	06/03/2021	NOTICE OF TELEPHONIC HEARING	540 - 547
1	02/18/2009	NOTICE TO CEASE CURRENT SUPPORT	62 - 62
1	07/29/2020	OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE JULY 6, 2020 MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS	223 - 235
2	11/30/2020	OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE OCTOBER 27, 2020 MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS	346 - 381
1	04/13/2007	OBJECTION TO MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND	17 - 18

I N D E X

<u>VOL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PLEADING</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER:</u>
		NOTICE OF OBJECTION - CHILD SUPPORT; OBJECTION TO MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS	
3	06/08/2021	OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY'S FEES AND ADOPTION OF MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OCTOBER 27, 2020, HEARING AND COUNTERMOTION TO VACATE THE HEARING, DEEM KORI A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT, AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS	548 - 570
3	07/12/2021	ORDER APPROVING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	660 - 663
3	04/28/2021	ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION	499 - 509
1	06/22/2007	ORDER ON OBJECTION	29 - 34
3	07/01/2021	ORDER RE: AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS TO PETITIONER	648 - 651
2	02/18/2021	ORDER TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS (CONFIDENTIAL)	468 - 470
2	02/22/2021	ORDER TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS (CONFIDENTIAL)	471 - 472
2	01/12/2021	PETITION FOR REVIEW (SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA DOCUMENT 81968)	426 - 433
1	01/06/2020	PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO KORI L. CAGE'S OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE DECEMBER 13, 2019 MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND COUNTERMOTION TO ADOPT MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL, AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS	84 - 101
1	07/31/2020	PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO KORI L. CAGE'S OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE JULY 6, 2020 MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS AND COUNTERMOTION TO ADOPT MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL, AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS (CONTINUED)	236 - 240
2	07/31/2020	PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO KORI L. CAGE'S OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE JULY 6, 2020 MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS AND COUNTERMOTION TO ADOPT MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL, AND FOR	241 - 266

06R136990

Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).

vs.

Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

I N D E X

<u>VOL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>PLEADING</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER:</u>
		ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS (CONTINUATION)	
1	04/07/2020	PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO KORI L. CAGE'S OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE MARCH 13, 2020 MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS AND COUNTERMOTION TO ADOPT MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL, AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS	157 - 188
2	01/22/2021	PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO KORI L. CAGE'S OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE OCTOBER 27, 2020 MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND COUNTERMOTION TO ADOPT MASTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL, AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS	444 - 465
2	12/08/2020	RECEIPT OF COPY	392 - 392
3	06/16/2021	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION	621 - 622
2	02/23/2021	RESPONDENT'S REPLY TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIVE AND APPEAL TO MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION (CONTINUED)	473 - 480
3	02/23/2021	RESPONDENT'S REPLY TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S OBJECTIVE AND APPEAL TO MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION (CONTINUATION)	481 - 496
1	03/30/2020	RESPONDENTS OBJECTION AND APPEAL OF THE MARCH 13, 2020 MASTERS RECOMMENDATION	113 - 139

1 distinction among people.³ See also the March 17, 2017 order, wherein the
2 Respondent was sanctioned \$2,000 for filing an untimely opposition while
3 Petitioners child support obligation was held in abeyance then reversed and
4 remanded by the Appellate Court.⁴
5

6 Allstate Ins. Co. V. Fackett, 125 Nev. Adv. Op.14 Pg.#, 206 P. #d 572, The
7 Supreme Court of Nevada discussed:
8

9 To determine legislative intent, this court first looks at the plain lain of a
10 statue. Salas v. Allstate Rent-A-Car Inc., 116 Nev. 1165, 1168, 14 P.3d 511, 513-
11 14 (2000). We only look beyond the plain language if it is ambiguous or silent on
12 the issue in question. Id. We read statutes within a statutory scheme harmoniously
13 with one another to avoid an unreasonable or absurd result. Torrealba v. Kesmetis,
14 124 Nev. __, __, 178 P.3d 716, 721 (2008).
15
16
17

18 VII. NRCP 11

19 According to NRS 18.010 (b) the court may make an allowance of attorney's
20 fees to a prevailing party: Without regard to the recovery sought, when the court
21 finds that the claim, counterclaim, cross-claim or third-party complaint or defense
22 of the opposing party was brought or maintained without reasonable ground or to
23
24
25
26

27 ³ See Rico v. Rodriguez, 121 Nev. 695, 703, 120 P.3s 812, 817 (2005). In re: effectuates
28 dissimilar treatment of similarly situated persons.

⁴ To date, the court has yet to have a remanded hearing under EDCR 1.90(a)(6)

1 harass the prevailing party. The court shall liberally construe the provisions of this
2 paragraph in favor of awarding attorney's fees in all appropriate situations. It is the
3 intent of the Legislature that the court award attorney's fees pursuant to this
4 paragraph and impose sanctions pursuant to Rule 11 of the Nevada Rules of Civil
5 Procedure in all appropriate situations to punish for and deter frivolous or
6 vexatious claims and defenses because such claims and defenses overburden
7 limited judicial resources, hinder the timely resolution of meritorious claims and
8 increase the costs of engaging in business and providing professional services to
9 the public.⁵

10
11 To date the Petitioner has yet to establish a good faith argument on why her
12 counterclaimed accused the Respondent of willful unemployment demanding
13 \$5,000 in attorney fees when [1] it is impossible to be willfully unemployed and
14 receive unemployment benefits by rule [2] Respondents claim was meritorious and
15 lawful.

16 17 18 19 20 21 **VIII. Disqualification of Judge Hughes**

22 Additionally, the Respondent withdraws his disqualification argument now
23 that Rena Hughes is no longer presiding over this case. Further, it is news to the
24
25
26

27 ⁵ See Petitioners November 18, 2019 frivolous countermotion claiming willful unemployment
28 while Respondent was receiving unemployment benefits, whereby rule, it is impossible to be
willfully unemployed and receive unemployment benefits.

1 Respondent that the Disqualification Decision and Order was filed February 27,
2 2020, as the Disqualification Decision and Order was deceptively **never** mailed to
3 the Respondent, presumably to obstruct and prevent the Respondent from
4 appealing his meritorious claim of biased, fraud and corruption.
5
6
7

8 **IX. Opposition to Attorney Fees**

9 In response to Petitioners exceptionally untimely opposition to which he is
10 now requesting more attorney fees, [1] the District Attorney, also untimely, already
11 filed an opposition to the Respondents objection, and the Petitioners opposition is
12 merely a watered-down argument mirroring that of the DA, and identical to his
13 previous oppositions. Therefore, the Petitioner was not forced to bring forth this
14 opposition. [2] Respondent brought forth this meritorious objection, lawfully, in
15 good faith and not to harass the Petitioner or increase litigation, rather to have his
16 objection heard by a new, non-biased Judge, and to be able to provide for his
17 precious and innocent children. [3] Despite Petitioners misrepresentation of facts,
18 Respondents objections have not been denied due to lack of merit, rather the
19 hearing masters recommendations were affirmed without reason.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **The American Rule & Opposition to NRS 18.010 (a) and EDRC 7.60 (b)**

2 Nevada has always followed the **American Rule** which says that unless
3
4 there are exceptional circumstances, such as a special court rule or a statute, each
5 of the litigants will pay their own attorney's fees. Smith v. Crown Fin. Svcs. Of
6 America, 111 Nev. 277, 281, 890 P.2d 769, 771 (1995), the Nevada Supreme
7 Court said: By retaining the requirement of a money judgment, this court preserves
8 the right of some Petitioners (and counterclaimants) to recover attorney fees while
9
10 subjecting defendants to the common law rule. This rule is faithful to the language
11 of NRS 18.010(2)(a),
12

13
14 The rationale for the American rule is that people should not be discouraged
15 from seeking redress for perceived wrongs in court or from trying to extend
16 coverage of the law. The rationale continues that society would suffer if a person
17 was unwilling to pursue a meritorious claim merely because that person would
18 have to pay the defendant's expenses if they lost.
19
20

21 **NRS 125B.140 (2)(C)(2)**

22 (2) A reasonable attorney's fees for the proceeding **unless the court finds**
23
24 **that the responsible parent would experience an undue hardship if required to**
25 **pay such amounts. Interest continues to accrue on the amount ordered until it**
26 **is paid, and additional attorney's fees must be allowed if required for**
27 **collection.**
28

1 It is evident based on Respondents filed Financial affidavit, This courts
2 recognized care of his two other children outside of this relationship, the
3 garnishment of Kori's wages for child support, and the fact that the Respondent is
4 on government assistance, it is unreasonable to pay opposing counsels attorney
5 fees as it would cause an undue hardship.
6
7

8 Furthermore, *Rivero v. Rivero*, 216 P.3d 213, 233 (Nev. 2009) Fifth finding
9 concluded that the district court abused its discretion by awarding Mr. Rivero
10 attorney fees as a sanction for Ms. Rivero's disqualification motion because the
11 district court made no determination whether the motion was frivolous, and no
12 evidence supports the sanction. This objection was brought forth in good faith; it
13 was warranted and necessary in pursuit of the truth and fair play.
14
15
16
17

18 XI. Prayer

19 Being that Brian Blackham garnered his relationship with Judge Hughes as
20 his law firm financially contributed to her 2014 election campaign, the
21 Respondents successful appeal of Judge Hughes March 16, 2017 decision to hold
22 Petitioners child support obligation in abeyance, Respondents complaint to the
23 Judicial board as well as Respondents attempt to disqualify Judge Hughes from
24 presiding over this case, it is reasonable to believe that Judge Hughes simply
25
26
27
28

1 rubber stamped all Brian's requests adverse to the Respondent. ⁶ Respondents only
2 ask is to receive a fair hearing for the impoverished and bullied pro se litigant.
3

4 **THEREFORE**, Petitioner prays for relief as follows:
5

- 6 1. Affirming Respondents objection in its entirety
- 7 2. Denying the DA and Petitioners opposition and counter motion in its entirety.
- 8 3. Denying the Master's Recommendation
- 9 4. For such further relief as the Court deems necessary and just.

10 DATED this 12 day of February 2021

11 Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of
12 perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
13

14 Kori Cage (signature)
15 KORI CAGE
16 Petitioner, Pro se
17
18
19
20


21 ⁶ See also the May 17, 2018 hearing to show cause for child support that was already
22 collected through CSE in which Judge Hughes denied Petitioners motion to hold Respondent in
23 contempt, yet still ordered Respondent to pay Petitioners attorney fees. The court should note
24 this fraudulent order has yet to be filed.

25 See also the April 26, 2018 decision and order that was copied wholesale from the
26 Petitioners February 4, 2018 closing brief 3 months after the January 26, 2017 evidential hearing
27 and weeks after the Respondents attorney resigned from counsel due to Respondents financial
28 constraints.

No remanded hearing under EDCR 1.90(a)(6)

Obstruction of 2 of the Respondents In forma pauperis applications (not in accordance
with NRAP 24) which were later accepted by the Supreme Court. (Exhibit 3)

Exhibit 1



☞☞☞ T-Mobile LTE

1:38 AM



+1 (503) 975-9656



10/25/14 11:25 AM

I getting ready to file papers to
modify child support. Can we
settle this out of court??? I
honestly would rather close
case indefinitely where no one
pays. Let me know asap please

Sat Oct 25 10:07 AM

R u coming to day?

I'm going to try for 12 but I'm
headed to the DMV now to get
another ten day pass to drive

Oh ok

If he wins tix can u take him

Of course



012

Exhibit 2



CPU CHOICE MARKET
8095 S RAINBOW BLVD
LAS VEGAS, NV 89139-6495
(800)275-8777

11/09/2020 04:57 PM

Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
---------	-----	------------	-------

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope Las Vegas, NV 89101 Weight: 0 lb 6.80 oz Estimated Delivery Date Fri 11/13/2020	1		\$2.20
---	---	--	--------

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope Las Vegas, NV 89119 Weight: 0 lb 6.80 oz Estimated Delivery Date Fri 11/13/2020	1		\$2.20
---	---	--	--------

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope Las Vegas, NV 89155 Weight: 0 lb 6.80 oz Estimated Delivery Date Fri 11/13/2020	1		\$2.20
---	---	--	--------

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope Las Vegas, NV 89101 Weight: 0 lb 6.80 oz Estimated Delivery Date Fri 11/13/2020	1		\$2.20
---	---	--	--------

Grand Total:			\$8.80
--------------	--	--	--------

Credit Card Remitted			\$8.80
----------------------	--	--	--------

Due to limited transportation
availability as a result of
nationwide COVID-19 impacts
package delivery times may be
extended. Priority Mail Express®
service will not change.

All sales final on stamps and postage.
Thank you for your business.

UFN: 314904-5556
Rece: #: 840-28900355-1-4466942-2
Clerk: 00

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 9 day of November 2020, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE OCTOBER 27, 2020 MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS in the United States Mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

Clerk's Office Filing Department
601 N Pecos Road
Las Vegas, NV 89101

GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM
Brian E. Blackham
725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Chief Judge Linda Bell
Dept VII – Crt. Rm 10E
Regional Justice Center
200 Lewis Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Steven B. Wolfson, DA
Family Support Division
1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119

DATED this 9 day of November 2020

Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Kori Cage (signature)
KORI CAGE
Petitioner, Pro se

Exhibit 3



MEMO
Family Division, Department J

Date: 5/25/18

To: Kori Cage

RE: D-07-374223-P

The proposed **Order/Decree** you submitted in the above case is being returned without signature for the following reasons:

1. Upon review of the Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis, the request for an Order to Proceed in Forma Pauperis has not been granted.

Please promptly resolve the above issues and then resubmit the proposed **Order/Decree** at your earliest convenience for further review.

THIS MEMO MUST ACCOMPANY RESUBMISSIONS. THIS MEMO IS A COURTESY ONLY AND MAY NOT INDICATE ALL DEFICIENCIES. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SUBMITTING PARTY TO THOROUGHLY REVIEW DOCUMENTS FOR ERRORS PRIOR TO RESUBMISSION.



MEMO
Family Division, Department J

Date: 4/7/20

To: Kori Cage

Re: Cage v Coppedge
D-07-374223-P

The proposed **Order/Decree** you submitted in the above case is being returned without signature for the following reasons:

1. Plaintiff must e-file an Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis.

Please promptly resolve the above issues and then resubmit the proposed **Order/Decree** at your earliest convenience for further review.

THIS MEMO MUST ACCOMPANY RESUBMISSIONS. THIS MEMO IS A *COURTESY ONLY* AND MAY NOT INDICATE ALL DEFICIENCIES. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SUBMITTING PARTY TO THOROUGHLY REVIEW DOCUMENTS FOR ERRORS PRIOR TO RESUBMISSION.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 12 day of February 2021, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL and CASE APPEAL STATEMENT in the United States Mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

Clerk's Office Filing Department
601 North Pecos Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Honorable Dee Butler
Family Court House Dept J
601 North Pecos Road
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Steven B. Wolfson, DA
Family Support Division
1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119


Brian E. Blackham / Leah Blakesley
725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

DATED this 12 day of February 2021

Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Kori Cage (signature)
KORI CAGE
Respondent, Pro se

RECEIVED
FEB 16 2021
CLERK OF THE COURT


CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

MALIKA COPPEDGE,
PETITIONER(S).

VS.

KORI L CAGE, RESPONDENT(S).

CASE NO: 06R136990

DEPARTMENT J

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING - CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

Submitted by:

Kori Cage

Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Telephone: _____

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 12 day of February 2021, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL and CASE APPEAL STATEMENT in the United States Mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

Clerk's Office Filing Department
601 North Pecos Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89155


Honorable Dee Butler
Family Court House Dept J
601 North Pecos Road
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Steven B. Wolfson, DA
Family Support Division
1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Brian E. Blackham / Leah Blakesley
725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

DATED this 12 day of February 2021

Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

 (signature)
KORI CAGE
Respondent, Pro se

OFO
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Nevada Bar No. 001565
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 East Flamingo Rd., Ste 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
(702) 671-9200
dafslegalgroup@clarkcountynvda.com
UPI – 437763100A

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP	)	
SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),	)	
	)	Case No.: 06R136990
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	Dept. No.: J /Child Support
	)	Court
KORI L. CAGE,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION

This matter having come on for hearing this 17th day of March, 2021, on the
Objection of the: ☒ Respondent ☐ Petitioner ☐ District Attorney's Office, Family
Support Division, (hereinafter, "DAFS"), to the Master's Recommendations from
the Child Support Court hearing held on the 27th day of October, 2020;

Respondent being ☐ present ☒ not present

Petitioner being ☐ present ☒ not present

Steven B. Wolfson, District Attorney, being not present by and through
Deputy District Attorney, COREY ROBERTS, Esq.,

1 NO HEARING HELD due to NRCP 1 and EDCR 1.10 states that the
2 procedure in district courts shall be administered to secure efficient, speedy, and
3 inexpensive determinations in every action. Pursuant to EDCR 2.23(c) and 5.501(b),
4 this Court can consider a motion and issue a decision on the papers at any time
5 without a hearing. Further, pursuant to EDCR 2.20(c), this Court can grant the
6 requested relief if there is no opposition timely filed.
7
8

9 The Court having reviewed the pleadings and papers herein and having heard
10 argument AND GOOD CAUSE THEREFORE APPEARING, this Court hereby
11 enters the following findings, conclusions and orders:
12

13 **COURT FINDS** that per NRS 425.3844(2); a recommendation entered by a
14 master must be furnished to each party at the conclusion of the proceedings or as
15 soon thereafter as possible. Within ten (10) days after receipt of the
16 recommendation, any party may file with the District Court and serve upon the other
17 parties a notice of objection to the recommendation. Pursuant to NRS 425.3844(3) if
18 the objection is not filed within (10) days of receipt of the recommendation, the
19 recommendation entered by the master shall be deemed approved by the District
20 Court, and the clerk of the District Court may file the recommendation and
21 judgement may be entered;
22
23

24 **COURT ALSO FINDS** the Master's Recommendation based on the October
25 27, 2020 hearing was filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020.
26
27

1 No objection had been filed by date. On November 30, 2020, eleven (11) days after
2 the Recommendation was filed by the clerk of the District Court and deemed
3 approved by the District Court, Respondent Cage filed his Objection to the
4 Recommendation. EDCR 1.40(e) addresses Child Support Masters specifically.
5 Accordingly, either party has ten (10) days after the conclusion of the proceeding
6 and receipt of the report to file and serve an objection to recommendations of child
7 support masters. Per NRCP 53(f)(1)(A), a party may file and serve objections to
8 masters report and recommendations (generally) within fourteen (14) days. NRCP
9 6(a)(1)(B) addresses the computation of time for filing motion papers. Parties are to
10 exclude the day of the event that triggers the period, count every day, including
11 intermediate weekends and holidays. Respondent Cage argues that his Objection
12 was filed timely;

13
14 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that the Respondent's argument that the October 27,
15 DSB
16 2020 hearing date must be excluding^{ed} when calculating time is correct;

17
18 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that Respondent's argument that the parties should
19 acknowledge time for receipt of the Recommendation sent to him via mail and time
20 for the clerk of the District Court to receive his Objection mailed to the court is
21 persuasive and correct. However, considering all arguments regarding whether
22 Respondent's Objection was filed timely, the deadline to file an Objection was
23 November 6, 2020 per the ten (10) day rule. Even allowing for the fourteen (14) day
24
25
26
27

1 rule, the deadline would have been November 10, 2020. Furthermore, giving
2 Respondent grace regarding potential delays in receipt of the Recommendation via
3 mail and mailing his Objection, the clerk filed the Recommendation on November
4 19, 2020, thirteen (13) days after the ten (10) day deadline and nine (9) days after the
5 fourteen (14) day deadline. Even giving Respondent Cage three or four days for
6 possible mail delays each way, the Objection was not filed until November 30, 2020.
7
8 The November 30, 2020 date is twenty-four (24) days beyond the ten (10) day
9 deadline and twenty (20) days beyond the 14 day deadline. Respondent Cage has
10 filed numerous pleadings in this matter since 2019, including pleadings to the
11 Supreme Court of Nevada. Respondent is aware of filing deadlines and must adhere
12 to them;
13
14

15 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that Respondent Cage's Objection was filed untimely
16 and will not be considered. Furthermore, per NRCP 53(e)(2) and EDCR 1.40(d), the
17 District Court SHALL accept the Master's Recommendations unless clearly
18 erroneous. The clearly erroneous standard of review generally means that the
19 reviewing court must have a definite and firm conviction that a mistake was
20 committed. No such finding can be made here. Lastly, Petitioner Coppedge alleges
21 that Respondent Cage has increased litigation costs which caused a financial burden
22 and forced her to incur unnecessary attorney's fees and costs. Respondent as filed at
23 least three objections.
24
25
26
27

1 **ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND**
2 **DECREED** that two prior objections were denied and now this objection filed
3 untimely is DENIED.
4

5 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that THIS
6 COURT ORDERS that Petitioner's request for attorney's fees and costs is
7 GRANTED. Counsel for Petitioner shall file a Memorandum of Fees and Costs,
8 submit an unredacted billing statement to Chambers, and submit a corresponding
9 Order for Attorney s Fees and Costs;
10

11 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
12 the Master's Recommendation from the October 27, 2020 hearing (**EXHIBIT 1**),
13

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


26

27

1 filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020, SHALL be affirmed
2 and adopted. DAFS shall submit the Order with the appropriate findings.

3 ~~DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021.~~

4
5 **Dated this 28th day of April, 2021**


6 

7 DEE SMART BUTLER,
8 HONORABLE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

9 **3CA D82 1F4C 727F**

Dee Smart Butler
District Court Judge

Submitted By:

10
11 

12 COREY ROBERTS, ESQ.
13 DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
14 Nevada Bar No. 12482
15 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
16 1900 East Flamingo Rd., Ste 100
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
18 (702) 671-9200
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1 MRAO
2 STEVEN B. WOLFSON
3 DISTRICT ATTORNEY
4 Nevada Bar No. 001565
5 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
6 1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
8 (702) 671-9200
9 TTY and/or other relay services: 711
437763100A

District Court
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

10 NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP SERVICES,)
11 (MALIKA COPPEDGE),)

Petitioner,)

Case No. **06R136990**

vs.)

Department No. **CHILD SUPPORT**

8 KORIL CAGE,)

9 Respondent.)

MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION

11 This matter having been heard on **OCTOBER 27, 2020** before the undersigned Hearing Master, having considered all the
12 evidence and having been fully advised in the premises, hereby makes the following Findings and Recommendations:

13 Parties present: ☒ Respondent ☐ Respondent's attorney ☒ Petitioner ☒ Petitioner's attorney

14 ☐ PATERNITY ☒ PATERNITY PREVIOUSLY DECIDED

15 ☒ FINANCIALS: ☐ CONTINUE PRIOR ORDERS (NO CHANGE TO PRIOR FINANCIAL ORDERS).

16 Basis for adjustment from state formula: _____

Respondent is to pay current support for the child(ren), **Kyree Cage, Jayla Nicole Cage,**

CHILD SUPPORT

17 Respondent is to pay monthly:

18 \$268.00 child support

19 _____ medical support

_____ spousal support

_____ arrears payment

20 ☐ ARREARAGES ☒ ARREARAGES NOT ADDRESSED AT THIS HEARING

\$ 268.00

TOTAL monthly payment is due on the 1st day of each month, and continues thereafter until said child(ren)
reach majority, become emancipated or further order of the Court.

22 Respondent's **INCOME SHALL BE WITHHELD** for the payment of support.

23 ☐ Good cause to stay income withholding is based on: _____. Said withholding shall be postponed until Respondent
becomes delinquent in an amount equal to 30 days support.

24 ☐ ENFORCEMENT OF CONTROLLING ORDER: The registered order from _____, dated _____, #_____, is hereby
confirmed and is the controlling order for the following reasons: ☐ only order _____.

25 ☐ ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTROLLING ORDER: This is the first order establishing a child support obligation for this
noncustodial parent for the child(ren) listed in this order who reside(s) with this custodian.

26 ☒ Health insurance coverage for the minor child(ren) herein:

☒ Respondent to provide: ☐ Petitioner to provide: ☐ Both Parties to provide:

☒ if available through employer. ☐ shall provide per court order.

27 ☒ Ordered Party(ies) to provide proof of said insurance to the District Attorney's Office, Family Support Division
within 90 days of today's date.

28 Under the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid is acceptable coverage.

EXHIBIT 1

☐ CONTEMPT OF COURT ☒ NOT A SHOW CAUSE HEARING

☒ MODIFICATION OF PRIOR ORDER:

☒ Modification effective: 10/1/2020.

☒ This order modifies a previously existing, previously controlling support order. By this modification, this tribunal assumes or retains continuing, exclusive jurisdiction of the child support obligation for the child(ren) and parties identified in this order. Modification is proper for the following reason(s):

☒ The previously controlling order is from Clark County, Nevada, dated April 23, 2018, #D-07-374223-P.

☒ An individual party, Kori Cage, has requested modification of the previously controlling Nevada support order.

☐ An individual party, _____, has requested modification; this tribunal has personal jurisdiction over the non-movant and the issuing state (the state whose order controlled prior to this modification) is no longer the residence of any individual party/contestant or child(ren).

☐ An individual party, _____, has requested modification; all individual parties and children now reside in Nevada.

☐ All parties have filed written consent with the tribunal whose order controlled prior to this modification for this tribunal to modify the support obligation and assume continuing, exclusive jurisdiction.

☐ SUSPENSION OF LICENSES:

PAYMENTS

All mailed payments MUST be made in the form of a cashier's check, money order or business check ONLY, made payable to State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU).

Payments can be mailed to:

State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU)
P.O. Box 98950
Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8950

Additionally, the following information must be included with each payment: name (first, middle, last) of person responsible for paying child support, social security number of person responsible for paying child support, child support case number, and name of petitioner (first and last name of person receiving child support).

NOTICE: NO CREDIT WILL BE GIVEN FOR PAYMENTS PAID DIRECTLY TO THE PETITIONER.

Please visit www.clarkcountynv.gov/district-attorney/fs for alternative payment options.

NOTICE: PRIOR ORDERS NOT SPECIFICALLY MODIFIED HEREIN REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT

NOTICE: Interest will be assessed on all unpaid child support balances for cases with a Nevada controlling order pursuant to NRS 99.040. If the Respondent pays support through income withholding and the full obligation is not met by the amount withheld by the employer, the Respondent is responsible to pay the difference between the court ordered obligation and the amount withheld by the employer directly to the state disbursement unit. If the Respondent fails to do so, he/she may be subject to assessment of interest. The Respondent may avoid these additional costs by making current support payments each month. If another state takes jurisdiction and obtains a new order, Nevada interest will only be calculated to the date of the new order and will be enforced.

NOTICE: Pursuant to NRS 125B.145 and federal law, EITHER parent, the legal guardian, and the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, where there is an assignment of support rights to the State, has the right to request a review of the support provision of this order at least every three (3) years to determine if modification is appropriate; an application for this purpose may be obtained from D.A. Family Support at 1900 E. Flamingo Rd., Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168.

NOTICE: Objections/Appeals are governed by EDCR1.40(e) and (f). You have ten (10) days from receipt of this Master's Recommendation to serve and file written objections to it. A failure to file and serve written objections will result in a final Order/Judgment being ordered by District Court.

NOTICE: Appeal from a Final Judgment by the Court is governed by NRAP 4 and must be filed within 30 days of written Notice of Entry of Judgment.

NOTICE: Respondent is responsible for notifying the District Attorney, Family Support Division, of any change of address, change of employment, health insurance coverage, change of custody, or any order relative to child support within ten (10) days of such change.

NOTICE: If you want to adjust the amount of child support established in this order, you MUST file a motion to modify the order with or submit a stipulation to the court. If a motion to modify the order is not filed or a stipulation is not submitted, the child support obligation established in this order will continue until such time as all children who are the subject of this order reach 18 years of age or, if the youngest child who is subject to this order is still in high school when he or she reaches 18 years of age, when the child graduates from high school or reaches 19 years of age, whichever comes first. Unless the parties agree otherwise in a stipulation, any modification made pursuant to a motion to modify the order will be effective as of the date the motion was filed.

Respondent to bring new financial statement and proof of income next date.

This order does not stay collection of support arrears by execution or any other means allowed by law.

MISCELLANEOUS FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Last payment- October 19, 2020 via UIB.

Parties have parallel Family District Court case, D-07-374223-P, wherein Petitioner was awarded Primary Physical Custody. See Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Judgment filed April 23, 2018. Nevada Supreme Court affirmed in part and reversed in part the order. See NV Supreme Court Clerk's Certificate/Judgment- Affd/Rev Part filed February 6, 2020.

Procedural History: Respondent requested modification based on a change of circumstance (20% change in income) pursuant to NRS 125B.145(4)/NAC 425.170(1). (1) December 13, 2019 set temporary order of \$323 per month based on GMI \$1,811 (25% of GMI = \$453) and downward deviation of \$65 per child per month for 2 additional children. Respondent is legally responsible for but continued the matter based on jurisdictional question as the Nevada Supreme Court had not issued a remittitur; temporary support order only to deal with contempt issue only. (2) March 13, 2020 hearing granted Respondent's request to reduce obligation, but left the obligation as temporary pending a hearing September 25, 2020 to determine Respondent's GMI as UIB may end September 2020. (3) July 6, 2020 and September 22, 2020 hearing dates were continued.

Respondent's prior Gross Monthly Income was \$3,262.44. A 20% change in income = \$652.49.

Respondent's current income via UIB to be \$418 per week x 52 weeks = annual income of \$21,736 / 12 months = Gross Monthly Income of \$1,811.33.


NAC 425 obligation for 2 children = \$398.49 (GMI: \$1,811.33 x 22%).

Respondent is legally responsible for 2 additional children, Kamryn Cage (03/26/2013); London Cage (02/09/2014), not of the relationship. \$130 deviation (\$65/month per child) discussed/considered at December 13, 2019 hearing. District Court's April 23, 2018 Judgment did not grant a deviation for other minor children.

Respondent receives Medicaid and Food stamps. Minor children have Medicaid under Respondent's public assistance program.

Childcare costs: none at this time.

NEXT HEARING DATE IS O/C in Courtroom in Child Support Court at Child Support Center of Southern Nevada, 1900 East Flamingo Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, for further proceedings.

DATED: OCTOBER 27, 2020

MASTER

USJR DISPOSITIONS

- ☒ - Settled/Withdrawn w/Judicial Conference/Hearing
☐ - Involuntary (Statutory) Dismissal
☐ - Dismissed / Want of Prosecution
☐ - Transferred to Another Jurisdiction
☐ - Other Manner of Dispo
☐ - Close Case

Respondent/Respondent's Attorney
 Receipt of this document is
 acknowledged by my signature.

ORDER/JUDGMENT


☐ The Clerk of the Court having reviewed the District Court's file and having determined that no objection has been filed within the ten day objection period, **the Master's Recommendation is hereby deemed approved by the District Court pursuant to NRS 425.3844.** The affixing of the Clerk of the Court's file stamp to this Master's Recommendation signifies that the ten-day objection period has expired without an objection having been filed and that the District Court deems the Master's Recommendation to be approved as an **ORDER/JUDGMENT** of the District Court, effective with the file stamp date, without need of a District Court Judge's signature affixed hereto. **The parties are ordered to comply with this Order/Judgment.**

☒ The District Court, having reviewed the above and foregoing Master's Recommendation, and having received and considered the objection thereto, as well as any other papers, testimony and argument related thereto and good cause appearing,

☒ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Master's Recommendation IS affirmed and adopted as an **ORDER/JUDGMENT** of the District Court this 28th day of Apri, 20 21.

☐ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Master's Recommendation IS NOT affirmed and adopted this _____ day of _____, 20____ and this matter is remanded to Child Support Court on _____, 20____ at _____, M.

Dated this 28th day of April, 2021




District Court Judge, Family Division

6AB 233 6D14 7113

Dee Smart Butler

District Court Judge

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark County District Attorney
 Nevada Bar No. 001565

By: 

DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
 1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5
6 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s). CASE NO: 06R136990
7 vs. DEPT. NO. Department J
8 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).
9

10 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

14 Service Date: 4/28/2021

15 Laura Deeter, Esq.	laura@ghandilaw.com
16 Brian Blackham, Esq.	brian@ghandilaw.com
17 Leah Blakesley, Esq.	leah@ghandilaw.com
18 Theresa Calabrese Vance	tcv@ghandilaw.com
19 Renee Humphrey	rmh@ghandilaw.com
20 Nedda Ghandi	nedda@ghandilaw.com
21 Public BY DAFS	DAFSLegalGroup@clarkcountyda.com
22 Joshua Boren	jb@ghandilaw.com

23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KORI LOVETT CAGE,
Appellant,
vs.
MALIKA COPPEDGE,
Respondent.

Supreme Court No. 82333
District Court Case No. R136990

FILED

MAY - 4 2021

Elizabeth A. Brown
CLERK OF COURT

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF NEVADA, ss.

I, Elizabeth A. Brown, the duly appointed and qualified Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true and correct copy of the Judgment in this matter.

JUDGMENT

The court being fully advised in the premises and the law, it is now ordered, adjudged and decreed, as follows:

"ORDERS this appeal DISMISSED."

Judgment, as quoted above, entered this 08 day of April, 2021.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed
my name and affixed the seal of the Supreme
Court at my Office in Carson City, Nevada this
May 03, 2021.

Elizabeth A. Brown, Supreme Court Clerk

By: Kaitlin Meetze
Administrative Assistant

06R136990
CCJD
NV Supreme Court Clerks Certificate/Judge
4953315



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KORI LOVETT CAGE,
Appellant,
vs.
MALIKA COPPEDGE,
Respondent.

No. 82333

FILED

APR 08 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *S. Y. [Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

This is a pro se appeal from an order denying appellant's motion to modify child support. Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Court Division, Clark County; Dedree Butler, Judge.

Review of the documents submitted to this court pursuant to NRAP 3(g) reveals a jurisdictional defect. Specifically, it appears the notice of appeal was filed more than 30 days after service of written notice of entry of the challenged order. See NRAP 4(a)(1); NRAP 26(c). The order was entered on November 19, 2020, and written notice of entry was filed and served on appellant on November 30, 2020. The notice of appeal was not filed until January 7, 2021, after the expiration of the 30 days permitted by NRAP 4(a)(1). Accordingly, the notice of appeal was untimely filed; this court lacks jurisdiction, and

ORDERS this appeal DISMISSED.

[Signature]
Parraguirre

[Signature] J.
Stiglich

[Signature] J.
Silver

Supreme Court
of
Nevada

EO 12974

21-10137

cc: Hon. Dedree Butler, District Judge, Family Court Division
Kori Lovett Cage
Ghandi Deeter Blackham
Eighth District Court Clerk

SUPREME COURT
OF
NEVADA

CD 1947A

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KORI LOVETT CAGE,
Appellant,
vs.
MALIKA COPPEDGE,
Respondent.

Supreme Court No. 82333
District Court Case No. R136990

REMITTITUR

TO: Steven D. Grierson, Eighth District Court Clerk

Pursuant to the rules of this court, enclosed are the following:

Certified copy of Judgment and Opinion/Order.
Receipt for Remittitur.

DATE: May 03, 2021

Elizabeth A. Brown, Clerk of Court

By: Kaitlin Meetze
Administrative Assistant

cc (without enclosures):

Hon. Dedree Butler, District Judge
Kori Lovett Cage
Ghandi Deeter Blackham \ Brian E. Blackham

RECEIPT FOR REMITTITUR

Received of Elizabeth A. Brown, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, the
REMITTITUR issued in the above-entitled cause, on MAY - 4 2021.

HEATHER UNGERMANN
Deputy District Court Clerk

RECEIVED
APPEALS

MAY - 4 2021

CLERK OF THE COURT



NEOJ
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Nevada Bar No. 0001565
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
(702) 671-9200
UPL:437763100A

IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP)
SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),)
)
Petitioner,)
) CASE NO.: 06R136990
vs.) DEPT. No.: J
) (Child Support Court)
KORI L. CAGE,)
)
Respondent.)

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

TO: KORI L. CAGE, Respondent,

TO: NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP SERVICES (MALIKA
COPPEDGE), Petitioner:

YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on the 28th day
of April, 2021, an ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION was entered in the above-


///

///

1 entitled matter, a copy of which is attached to this Notice.

2 DATED this 11th day of May, 2021.

3
4 Respectfully submitted,
5 Steven B. Wolfson
6 Clark County District Attorney
7 Nevada Bar No. 001565

8 By: 
9 COREY ROBERTS, ESQ.
10 Deputy District Attorney
11 Nevada Bar #012482
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


1 Cert

Case No. 06R136990

2 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

3
4 I hereby certify that service of the above **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER**
5 was made this 11th day of May, 2021, by depositing a copy of same in the United States
6 mail, postage prepaid, addressed to:
7

8 **KORI CAGE**
9 **8655 ROWLAND BLUFF AVE.**
10 **LAS VEGAS, NV 89178**

11
12 By: 
13 Employee, Clark County
14 District Attorney's Office,
15 Family Support Division
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Cert

Case No. 06R136990

2
3
4 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

5
6 I hereby certify that service of the above **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER**
7 was made this 11th day of May, 2021 by depositing a copy of same in the United States
8 mail, postage prepaid, addressed to:
9

10 **LEAH BLAKESLEY, ESQ.**
11 **725 SOUTH 8TH STREET, #100**
12 **LAS VEGAS, NV 89101**
13 **ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER**

14
15 By: 
16 Employee, Clark County
17 District Attorney's Office,
18 Family Support Division
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

OFO
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Nevada Bar No. 001565
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 East Flamingo Rd., Ste 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
(702) 671-9200
dafslegalgroup@clarkcountynvda.com
UPI – 437763100A

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP	)	
SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),	)	
	)	Case No.: 06R136990
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	Dept. No.: J /Child Support
	)	Court
KORI L. CAGE,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION

This matter having come on for hearing this 17th day of March, 2021, on the
Objection of the: ☒ Respondent ☐ Petitioner ☐ District Attorney's Office, Family
Support Division, (hereinafter, "DAFS"), to the Master's Recommendations from
the Child Support Court hearing held on the 27th day of October, 2020;

Respondent being ☐ present ☒ not present

Petitioner being ☐ present ☒ not present

Steven B. Wolfson, District Attorney, being not present by and through
Deputy District Attorney, COREY ROBERTS, Esq.,

1 NO HEARING HELD due to NRCP 1 and EDCR 1.10 states that the
2 procedure in district courts shall be administered to secure efficient, speedy, and
3 inexpensive determinations in every action. Pursuant to EDCR 2.23(c) and 5.501(b),
4 this Court can consider a motion and issue a decision on the papers at any time
5 without a hearing. Further, pursuant to EDCR 2.20(c), this Court can grant the
6 requested relief if there is no opposition timely filed.
7
8

9 The Court having reviewed the pleadings and papers herein and having heard
10 argument AND GOOD CAUSE THEREFORE APPEARING, this Court hereby
11 enters the following findings, conclusions and orders:
12

13 **COURT FINDS** that per NRS 425.3844(2); a recommendation entered by a
14 master must be furnished to each party at the conclusion of the proceedings or as
15 soon thereafter as possible. Within ten (10) days after receipt of the
16 recommendation, any party may file with the District Court and serve upon the other
17 parties a notice of objection to the recommendation. Pursuant to NRS 425.3844(3) if
18 the objection is not filed within (10) days of receipt of the recommendation, the
19 recommendation entered by the master shall be deemed approved by the District
20 Court, and the clerk of the District Court may file the recommendation and
21 judgement may be entered;
22
23

24 **COURT ALSO FINDS** the Master's Recommendation based on the October
25 27, 2020 hearing was filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020.
26
27

1 No objection had been filed by date. On November 30, 2020, eleven (11) days after
2 the Recommendation was filed by the clerk of the District Court and deemed
3 approved by the District Court, Respondent Cage filed his Objection to the
4 Recommendation. EDCR 1.40(e) addresses Child Support Masters specifically.
5 Accordingly, either party has ten (10) days after the conclusion of the proceeding
6 and receipt of the report to file and serve an objection to recommendations of child
7 support masters. Per NRCP 53(f)(1)(A), a party may file and serve objections to
8 masters report and recommendations (generally) within fourteen (14) days. NRCP
9 6(a)(1)(B) addresses the computation of time for filing motion papers. Parties are to
10 exclude the day of the event that triggers the period, count every day, including
11 intermediate weekends and holidays. Respondent Cage argues that his Objection
12 was filed timely;

13
14 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that the Respondent's argument that the October 27,
15 DSB
16 2020 hearing date must be excluding^{ed} when calculating time is correct;

17
18 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that Respondent's argument that the parties should
19 acknowledge time for receipt of the Recommendation sent to him via mail and time
20 for the clerk of the District Court to receive his Objection mailed to the court is
21 persuasive and correct. However, considering all arguments regarding whether
22 Respondent's Objection was filed timely, the deadline to file an Objection was
23 November 6, 2020 per the ten (10) day rule. Even allowing for the fourteen (14) day
24
25
26
27

1 rule, the deadline would have been November 10, 2020. Furthermore, giving
2 Respondent grace regarding potential delays in receipt of the Recommendation via
3 mail and mailing his Objection, the clerk filed the Recommendation on November
4 19, 2020, thirteen (13) days after the ten (10) day deadline and nine (9) days after the
5 fourteen (14) day deadline. Even giving Respondent Cage three or four days for
6 possible mail delays each way, the Objection was not filed until November 30, 2020.
7
8 The November 30, 2020 date is twenty-four (24) days beyond the ten (10) day
9 deadline and twenty (20) days beyond the 14 day deadline. Respondent Cage has
10 filed numerous pleadings in this matter since 2019, including pleadings to the
11 Supreme Court of Nevada. Respondent is aware of filing deadlines and must adhere
12 to them;
13
14

15 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that Respondent Cage's Objection was filed untimely
16 and will not be considered. Furthermore, per NRCP 53(e)(2) and EDCR 1.40(d), the
17 District Court SHALL accept the Master's Recommendations unless clearly
18 erroneous. The clearly erroneous standard of review generally means that the
19 reviewing court must have a definite and firm conviction that a mistake was
20 committed. No such finding can be made here. Lastly, Petitioner Coppedge alleges
21 that Respondent Cage has increased litigation costs which caused a financial burden
22 and forced her to incur unnecessary attorney's fees and costs. Respondent as filed at
23 least three objections.
24
25
26
27

1 **ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND**
2 **DECREED** that two prior objections were denied and now this objection filed
3 untimely is DENIED.
4

5 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that THIS
6 COURT ORDERS that Petitioner's request for attorney's fees and costs is
7 GRANTED. Counsel for Petitioner shall file a Memorandum of Fees and Costs,
8 submit an unredacted billing statement to Chambers, and submit a corresponding
9 Order for Attorney s Fees and Costs;
10

11 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
12 the Master's Recommendation from the October 27, 2020 hearing (**EXHIBIT 1**),
13

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


26

27

1 filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020, SHALL be affirmed
2 and adopted. DAFS shall submit the Order with the appropriate findings.

3 ~~DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021.~~

4
5 Dated this 28th day of April, 2021


6 

7 DEE SMART BUTLER,
8 HONORABLE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

9 **3CA D82 1F4C 727F**

Dee Smart Butler
District Court Judge

Submitted By:

10
11 

12 COREY ROBERTS, ESQ.
13 DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
14 Nevada Bar No. 12482
15 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
16 1900 East Flamingo Rd., Ste 100
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
18 (702) 671-9200
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1 MRAO
2 STEVEN B. WOLFSON
3 DISTRICT ATTORNEY
4 Nevada Bar No. 001565
5 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
6 1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
8 (702) 671-9200
9 TTY and/or other relay services: 711
437763100A

District Court
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

10 NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP SERVICES,)
11 (MALIKA COPPEDGE),)

Petitioner,)

Case No. **06R136990**

vs.)

Department No. **CHILD SUPPORT**

8 KORIL CAGE,)

Respondent.)

MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION

11 This matter having been heard on **OCTOBER 27, 2020** before the undersigned Hearing Master, having considered all the
12 evidence and having been fully advised in the premises, hereby makes the following Findings and Recommendations:

13 Parties present: ☒ Respondent ☐ Respondent's attorney ☒ Petitioner ☒ Petitioner's attorney

14 ☐ PATERNITY ☒ PATERNITY PREVIOUSLY DECIDED

15 ☒ FINANCIALS: ☐ CONTINUE PRIOR ORDERS (NO CHANGE TO PRIOR FINANCIAL ORDERS).

16 Basis for adjustment from state formula: _____

Respondent is to pay current support for the child(ren), **Kyree Cage, Jayla Nicole Cage,**

CHILD SUPPORT

17 Respondent is to pay monthly:

18 \$268.00 child support

_____ medical support

_____ spousal support

_____ arrears payment

20 ☐ ARREARAGES ☒ ARREARAGES NOT ADDRESSED AT THIS HEARING

\$ 268.00

TOTAL monthly payment is due on the 1st day of each month, and continues thereafter until said child(ren)
reach majority, become emancipated or further order of the Court.

22 Respondent's **INCOME SHALL BE WITHHELD** for the payment of support.

23 ☐ Good cause to stay income withholding is based on: _____. Said withholding shall be postponed until Respondent
becomes delinquent in an amount equal to 30 days support.

24 ☐ ENFORCEMENT OF CONTROLLING ORDER: The registered order from _____, dated _____, #_____, is hereby
confirmed and is the controlling order for the following reasons: ☐ only order _____.

25 ☐ ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTROLLING ORDER: This is the first order establishing a child support obligation for this
noncustodial parent for the child(ren) listed in this order who reside(s) with this custodian.

26 ☒ Health insurance coverage for the minor child(ren) herein:

☒ Respondent to provide: ☐ Petitioner to provide: ☐ Both Parties to provide:

☒ if available through employer. ☐ shall provide per court order.

27 ☒ Ordered Party(ies) to provide proof of said insurance to the District Attorney's Office, Family Support Division
within 90 days of today's date.

28 Under the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid is acceptable coverage.

EXHIBIT 1

☐ CONTEMPT OF COURT ☒ NOT A SHOW CAUSE HEARING

☒ MODIFICATION OF PRIOR ORDER:

☒ Modification effective: 10/1/2020.

☒ This order modifies a previously existing, previously controlling support order. By this modification, this tribunal assumes or retains continuing, exclusive jurisdiction of the child support obligation for the child(ren) and parties identified in this order. Modification is proper for the following reason(s):

☒ The previously controlling order is from Clark County, Nevada, dated April 23, 2018, #D-07-374223-P.

☒ An individual party, Kori Cage, has requested modification of the previously controlling Nevada support order.

☐ An individual party, _____, has requested modification; this tribunal has personal jurisdiction over the non-movant and the issuing state (the state whose order controlled prior to this modification) is no longer the residence of any individual party/contestant or child(ren).

☐ An individual party, _____, has requested modification; all individual parties and children now reside in Nevada.

☐ All parties have filed written consent with the tribunal whose order controlled prior to this modification for this tribunal to modify the support obligation and assume continuing, exclusive jurisdiction.

☐ SUSPENSION OF LICENSES:

PAYMENTS

All mailed payments MUST be made in the form of a cashier's check, money order or business check ONLY, made payable to State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU).

Payments can be mailed to:

State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU)
P.O. Box 98950
Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8950

Additionally, the following information must be included with each payment: name (first, middle, last) of person responsible for paying child support, social security number of person responsible for paying child support, child support case number, and name of petitioner (first and last name of person receiving child support).

NOTICE: NO CREDIT WILL BE GIVEN FOR PAYMENTS PAID DIRECTLY TO THE PETITIONER.

Please visit www.clarkcountynv.gov/district-attorney/fs for alternative payment options.

NOTICE: PRIOR ORDERS NOT SPECIFICALLY MODIFIED HEREIN REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT

NOTICE: Interest will be assessed on all unpaid child support balances for cases with a Nevada controlling order pursuant to NRS 99.040. If the Respondent pays support through income withholding and the full obligation is not met by the amount withheld by the employer, the Respondent is responsible to pay the difference between the court ordered obligation and the amount withheld by the employer directly to the state disbursement unit. If the Respondent fails to do so, he/she may be subject to assessment of interest. The Respondent may avoid these additional costs by making current support payments each month. If another state takes jurisdiction and obtains a new order, Nevada interest will only be calculated to the date of the new order and will be enforced.

NOTICE: Pursuant to NRS 125B.145 and federal law, EITHER parent, the legal guardian, and the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, where there is an assignment of support rights to the State, has the right to request a review of the support provision of this order at least every three (3) years to determine if modification is appropriate; an application for this purpose may be obtained from D.A. Family Support at 1900 E. Flamingo Rd., Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168.

NOTICE: Objections/Appeals are governed by EDCR1.40(e) and (f). You have ten (10) days from receipt of this Master's Recommendation to serve and file written objections to it. A failure to file and serve written objections will result in a final Order/Judgment being ordered by District Court.

NOTICE: Appeal from a Final Judgment by the Court is governed by NRAP 4 and must be filed within 30 days of written Notice of Entry of Judgment.

NOTICE: Respondent is responsible for notifying the District Attorney, Family Support Division, of any change of address, change of employment, health insurance coverage, change of custody, or any order relative to child support within ten (10) days of such change.

NOTICE: If you want to adjust the amount of child support established in this order, you MUST file a motion to modify the order with or submit a stipulation to the court. If a motion to modify the order is not filed or a stipulation is not submitted, the child support obligation established in this order will continue until such time as all children who are the subject of this order reach 18 years of age or, if the youngest child who is subject to this order is still in high school when he or she reaches 18 years of age, when the child graduates from high school or reaches 19 years of age, whichever comes first. Unless the parties agree otherwise in a stipulation, any modification made pursuant to a motion to modify the order will be effective as of the date the motion was filed.

Respondent to bring new financial statement and proof of income next date.

This order does not stay collection of support arrears by execution or any other means allowed by law.

MISCELLANEOUS FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Last payment- October 19, 2020 via UIB.

Parties have parallel Family District Court case, D-07-374223-P, wherein Petitioner was awarded Primary Physical Custody. See Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Judgment filed April 23, 2018. Nevada Supreme Court affirmed in part and reversed in part the order. See NV Supreme Court Clerk's Certificate/Judgment- Affd/Rev Part filed February 6, 2020.

Procedural History: Respondent requested modification based on a change of circumstance (20% change in income) pursuant to NRS 125B.145(4)/NAC 425.170(1). (1) December 13, 2019 set temporary order of \$323 per month based on GMI \$1,811 (25% of GMI = \$453) and downward deviation of \$65 per child per month for 2 additional children. Respondent is legally responsible for but continued the matter based on jurisdictional question as the Nevada Supreme Court had not issued a remittitur; temporary support order only to deal with contempt issue only. (2) March 13, 2020 hearing granted Respondent's request to reduce obligation, but left the obligation as temporary pending a hearing September 25, 2020 to determine Respondent's GMI as UIB may end September 2020. (3) July 6, 2020 and September 22, 2020 hearing dates were continued.

Respondent's prior Gross Monthly Income was \$3,262.44. A 20% change in income = \$652.49.

Respondent's current income via UIB to be \$418 per week x 52 weeks = annual income of \$21,736 / 12 months = Gross Monthly Income of \$1,811.33.

NAC 425 obligation for 2 children = \$398.49 (GMI: \$1,811.33 x 22%).


Respondent is legally responsible for 2 additional children, Kamryn Cage (03/26/2013); London Cage (02/09/2014), not of the relationship. \$130 deviation (\$65/month per child) discussed/considered at December 13, 2019 hearing. District Court's April 23, 2018 Judgment did not grant a deviation for other minor children.

Respondent receives Medicaid and Food stamps. Minor children have Medicaid under Respondent's public assistance program.

Childcare costs: none at this time.

NEXT HEARING DATE IS O/C in Courtroom in Child Support Court at Child Support Center of Southern Nevada, 1900 East Flamingo Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, for further proceedings.

DATED: OCTOBER 27, 2020



MASTER

USJR DISPOSITIONS

- ☒ - Settled/Withdrawn w/Judicial Conference/Hearing
☐ - Involuntary (Statutory) Dismissal
☐ - Dismissed / Want of Prosecution
☐ - Transferred to Another Jurisdiction
☐ - Other Manner of Dispo
☐ - Close Case

Respondent/Respondent's Attorney
 Receipt of this document is
 acknowledged by my signature.

ORDER/JUDGMENT


☐ The Clerk of the Court having reviewed the District Court's file and having determined that no objection has been filed within the ten day objection period, **the Master's Recommendation is hereby deemed approved by the District Court pursuant to NRS 425.3844.** The affixing of the Clerk of the Court's file stamp to this Master's Recommendation signifies that the ten-day objection period has expired without an objection having been filed and that the District Court deems the Master's Recommendation to be approved as an **ORDER/JUDGMENT** of the District Court, effective with the file stamp date, without need of a District Court Judge's signature affixed hereto. **The parties are ordered to comply with this Order/Judgment.**

☒ The District Court, having reviewed the above and foregoing Master's Recommendation, and having received and considered the objection thereto, as well as any other papers, testimony and argument related thereto and good cause appearing,

☒ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Master's Recommendation IS affirmed and adopted as an **ORDER/JUDGMENT** of the District Court this 28th day of Apri, 20 21.

☐ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Master's Recommendation IS NOT affirmed and adopted this _____ day of _____, 20____ and this matter is remanded to Child Support Court on _____, 20____ at _____, M.

Dated this 28th day of April, 2021




District Court Judge, Family Division

6AB 233 6D14 7113

Dee Smart Butler

District Court Judge

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark County District Attorney
 Nevada Bar No. 001565

By: 
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5
6 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s). CASE NO: 06R136990
7 vs. DEPT. NO. Department J
8 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).
9

10 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

14 Service Date: 4/28/2021

15 Laura Deeter, Esq.	laura@ghandilaw.com
16 Brian Blackham, Esq.	brian@ghandilaw.com
17 Leah Blakesley, Esq.	leah@ghandilaw.com
18 Theresa Calabrese Vance	tcv@ghandilaw.com
19 Renee Humphrey	rmh@ghandilaw.com
20 Nedda Ghandi	nedda@ghandilaw.com
21 Public BY DAFS	DAFSLegalGroup@clarkcountyda.com
22 Joshua Boren	jb@ghandilaw.com

23
24
25
26
27
28

Alvin B. Smith
CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **MRCN**
2 **KORI CAGE**
3 8655 Rowland Bluff Ave
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89178
5 Phone: (702) 771-2506
6 kcage01@gmail.com

7 Respondent in Proper Person

8 **DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

9
10 **NEVADA DEPT. OF HEALTH &**
11 **HUMAN SERVICES, DIV. OF**
12 **WELFARE & SUPPORTIVE**
13 **SERVICES, AND MALIKA**
14 **COPPEDGE**

15 Petitioner,

16 vs.

17 **KORI CAGE**

18 Respondent.
19

Case No.: R136990

Dept. No. Child Support

Oral Argument Requested: NO

20
21 **MOTION TO RECONSIDER PETITIONERS ATTORNEY FEES AND**

22 **ADOPTION OF MASTERS RECCOMENDATIONS FROM THE**

23 **OCTOBER 27, 2020 HEARING**

24
25 **COMES NOW**, Respondent, Kori Cage, appearing in proper person, and
26
27 hereby pursuant to EDCR 5.513 brings forth this Motion to Reconsider Petitioners
28

1 attorney fees and the adoption of Master's Recommendations from the October 27,
2 2020 hearing. This reconsideration is in accordance to NRS 238.100 (1) (Date of
3 postmark deemed date of filing or payment)¹ and based upon the following
4 memorandum of points and authorities and the appendix of exhibits on file herein.
5
6

7 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

8 **I. Reconsideration of Respondents untimely objection**

9
10 The DA, Petitioner and Respondent are in agreement that the deadline to file
11 his objection from the October 27, 2020 hearing was November 10, 2020,
12 However the Respondent disagrees with the court that the filing date should reflect
13 November 20, 2020, 28 days past the deadline. Under NRS 238.100
14
15

16 (1) any document or payment required or permitted by law or regulation to
17 be filed or made by mailing to the State or any of its agencies or political
18 subdivisions shall be deemed filed or made on the date of the postmark dated
19 by the post office on the envelope in which it was mailed.

20 (2) If a document or payment was mailed but not received by the addressee
21 or was received but the postmarked date is illegible or omitted, the document
22 or payment shall be deemed filed or made on the date it was mailed, if the
23 sender:

24 (a) Establishes by a postal receipt for registered or certified mail that
25 the mailing date was on or before the required date for filing or
26 payment; and
27

28 ¹ Court minutes emailed 4/21/2021

1 Here, the Respondents objection was mailed and postmarked November 9,
2 2020, therefore the filing date should reflect that date as well. (Exhibit 1)
3

4 **II. Reconsideration of Petitioners Attorney fees**

5
6 Additionally, as stated in the March 17, 2021 court minutes, "Petitioner
7 alleges that Respondent Cage has increased litigation costs which caused a
8 financial burden and forced her to incur unnecessary attorney fees and costs.
9 Respondent has filed at least 3 objections. Two prior objections were denied and
10 now this objection filed untimely is denied." The court then granted Petitioners
11 request for attorney's fees, directing Petitioner to submit an unredacted billing
12 statement and submit a corresponding Order for attorney's fees and cost. [1] Due
13 to Petitioners prior fabrication of attorney fees², Respondent is requesting a copy of
14 the unredacted billing statement to review. [2] Under NRS 18.010(2)(b)) a motion
15 must be found frivolous³ in order to grant attorney fees. See also Rivero v. Rivero,
16 216 P.3d 213, 233 (Nev. 2009) discussing
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 ² See March 17, 2018 hearing

26 ³ A claim is frivolous when the claim lacks any arguable basis either in law or in fact Neitze v.
27 Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). That means, in a frivolous claim, either: "(1) 'the 'factual
28 contentions are clearly baseless, such as when allegations are the product of delusion or fantasy;"
or (2) "the claim is 'based on an indisputably meritless legal theory.'" Livingston v. Adirondack
Beverage Co., 141 F.3d 434, 437 (2d Cir. 1998).

1 The district court may award attorney fees as a sanction under NRS
2 18.010(2)(b), NRCP 11, and EDCR 7.60(b) if it concludes that a party brought a
3 frivolous claim. The district court must determine if there was any credible
4 evidence or reasonable basis for the claim at the time of filing. *Semenza v.*
5 *Caughlin Crafted Homes*, 111 Nev. 1089, 1095, 901_P.2d_684, 687-88 (1995)
6 (discussing NRS 18.010(2)(b)). Although a district court has discretion to award
7 attorney fees as a sanction, there must be evidence supporting the district court's
8 finding that the claim or defense was unreasonable or brought to harass. *Id.*

9 “It further discusses that “Although Ms. Rivero did not prevail on
10 the motion, and it may have been without merit, that alone is insufficient for a
11 determination that the motion was frivolous, warranting sanctions. Nothing in
12 the record indicates that the district court attempted to determine if there was any
13 credible evidence or a reasonable basis for Ms. Rivero's motion to disqualify.
14 Because the chief judge did not hold a hearing or make findings of fact, no
15 evidence demonstrates that Ms. Rivero's motion was unreasonable or brought to
16 harass.”

17 If the court believes that Respondents objection was meritless the
18 Respondent contends that the court did not conclude that Respondent objection
19 was frivolous nor make findings of fact that Cage's motion was unreasonable or
20 brought to harass.

1 Agwara v. DCP Inv. Holding discusses Pardee Homes, 135 Nev. At
2 177, 444P.3d at 427 prohibiting an award of attorney fees as special damages
3
4 simply because of the necessity of commencing or defending an action based on
5 the injurious conduct of another, stating that “the mere fact that a party was forced
6 to defend a lawsuit is insufficient to support an award of attorney fees as special
7 damages.” In Sandy Valley, 117 Nev. At 956-57, 35 P.3d at 969-70 the Supreme
8 Court outlines the necessary steps to properly plead a claim for attorney fees as
9 special damages which has been narrowed and clarified several times since the
10 opinion was published in 2001, creating a limited exception to the American Rule.
11
12

13
14 Further, the fact the Respondents meritorious and lawful previous objections
15 were denied without reason is not indicative of frivolousness. If that were the
16 standard then, then voluminous requests for Petitioners attorney fees were also
17 denied and should therefore be deemed frivolous. Although it may have Increased
18 litigation expenses, the Respondent had the legal right and every objection was
19 different, brought forth in good faith and not to harass. If procedures were followed
20 (sua sponte order reducing to judgment) and laws were enforced (NRS
21 125.080(9)(l) relative income) or enacted timely (NAC 425.150), etc. these
22 proceeding would have ended March 13, 2020.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 . Lastly, as an unrepresented, indigenous male the government has not treated
2 similar situated people alike, as Respondents "untimely" objection was not
3 considered while Petitioner's "untimely" objection were considered (attorney fees
4 and the decision to not consider Respondents objection.) This conduct has clearly
5 created classification or distinction among people.⁴
6
7
8
9
10

11 **THEREFORE**, Respondent prays for relief as follows:

- 12 1. To reconsider the courts "untimely filing" decision and consider
13 Respondents objection.
14 2. To reconsider and deny the award of Petitioners attorney fees.

15 DATED this 30 day of April 2021

16 Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of
17 perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

18
19 Kori Cage (signature)
20 KORI CAGE
21 Petitioner, Pro se
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 ⁴ See Rico v. Rodriguez, 121 Nev. 695, 703, 120 P.3s 812, 817 (2005). In re: effectuates
dissimilar treatment of similarly situated persons.

Exhibit 1



CPU CHOICE MARKET
8095 S RAINBOW BLVD
LAS VEGAS, NV 89139-6495
(800)275-8777

11/09/2020 04:57 PM

Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
---------	-----	------------	-------

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$2.20
Las Vegas, NV 89101			
Weight: 0 lb 6.80 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Fri 11/13/2020			

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$2.20
Las Vegas, NV 89119			
Weight: 0 lb 6.80 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Fri 11/13/2020			

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$2.20
Las Vegas, NV 89155			
Weight: 0 lb 6.80 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Fri 11/13/2020			

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$2.20
Las Vegas, NV 89101			
Weight: 0 lb 6.80 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Fri 11/13/2020			

Grand Total:			\$8.80
--------------	--	--	--------

Credit Card Remitted			\$8.80
----------------------	--	--	--------

Due to limited transportation
availability as a result of
nationwide COVID-19 impacts
package delivery times may be
extended. Priority Mail Express®
service will not change.

All sales final on stamps and postage.
Thank you for your business.

UFN: 314904-5556
Rece: #: 840-28900355-1 4466942-2
Clerk: 00

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 9 day of November 2020, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing OBJECTION AND APPEAL THE OCTOBER 27, 2020 MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS in the United States Mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

Clerk's Office Filing Department
601 N Pecos Road
Las Vegas, NV 89101

GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM
Brian E. Blackham
725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Chief Judge Linda Bell
Dept VII - Crt. Rm 10E
Regional Justice Center
200 Lewis Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Steven B. Wolfson, DA
Family Support Division
1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119

DATED this 9 day of November 2020

Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Kori Cage (signature)
KORI CAGE
Petitioner, Pro se

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the ____ day of April 2021, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing MOTION TO RECONSIDER PETITIONERS ATTORNEY FEES AND ADOPTION OF MASTERS RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OCTOBER 27, 2020 HEARING in the United States Mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

Clerk's Office Filing Department
601 North Pecos Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Steven B. Wolfson, DA
Family Support Division
1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Brian E. Blackham / Leah Blakesley
725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

DATED this 30 day of April 2021

Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.


Kori Cage (signature)
KORI CAGE
Respondent, Pro se

RECEIVED
MAY 14 2021
CLERK OF THE COURT

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

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Electronically Filed
5/25/2021 4:06 PM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT



Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
vs.
Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

Case No.: 06R136990
Department: Child Support

NOTICE OF HEARING

Please be advised that the Respondent in the above-entitled matter is set for hearing as follows:

Date: June 29, 2021
Time: 2:30 PM
Location: Greystone Courtroom #1
1900 E. Flamingo Rd #100
Las Vegas, NV 89119

NOTE: Under NEFCR 9(d), if a party is not receiving electronic service through the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing System, the movant requesting a hearing must serve this notice on the party by traditional means.

STEVEN D. GRIERSON, CEO/Clerk of the Court

By: /s/ A Simon
Deputy Clerk of the Court

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that pursuant to Rule 9(b) of the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules a copy of this Notice of Hearing was electronically served to all registered users on this case in the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing System.

By: /s/ A Simon
Deputy Clerk of the Court



NOH
Steven B. Wolfson, District Attorney
Nevada Bar No. 001565
Family Support Division
1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
(702) 671-9200 - TTY and/or other relay services: 711
437763100A

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP	)	
SERVICES, (MALIKA COPPEDGE)	)	
	)	Case no. 06R136990
	)	Petitioner,
	)	
	)	Dept. no. CHILD SUPPORT
vs.	)	
	)	
KORI L CAGE	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	Respondent

NOTICE OF TELEPHONIC HEARING

Due to COVID-19 and Governor Sisolak's social distancing mandate, all court hearings will be conducted by audio/visual appearance. Please do not appear in person. Please be patient as delays may occur. Instructions on how to participate by the Court's audio/visual program called BlueJeans are attached.

Go to: <https://www.bluejeans.com>
Meeting No. 651 753 846
Or
Phone Dial-in
1 (408) 419-1715
Meeting No. 651 753 846

Steven B. Wolfson, District Attorney
Nevada Bar No. 001565
Family Support Division
1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
(702) 671-9200 - TTY and/or other relay services: 711

NOHCR1

1 To: KORI LOVETT CAGE, Respondent

2 To: MALIKA COPPEDGE, Petitioner

3 Notice is hereby given that the undersigned will bring the above-entitled matter
4 before the Child Support Hearing Master on the 29th day of June, 2021 at
5 the hour of 2:30 PM PT (Pacific Time) in Court Room 1 of the Child Support
6 Center of Southern Nevada, **1900 East Flamingo Road Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada**
7 **89119**, for review pursuant to NAC 425, NRS 31A, NRS 125B, NRS 126, NRS 130
8 and/or NRS 425.

9 ☐ **This is an Initial Hearing** pursuant to the Notice and Finding of Financial
10 Responsibility to Establish an Obligation or Determine Paternity. The purpose for
11 this Hearing is to address:

12 ☐ The Respondent's/Petitioner's/DAFS' request regarding:

13 ☐ **This is not an Initial Hearing.** The purpose of this hearing is to address:

14 ☐ The Respondent's/Petitioner's/DAFS' request regarding:

15 ☐ **This is an Order to Show Cause Hearing** for Respondent to answer why
16 (s)he is not complying with the Court's order. The Court is asked to make a
17 determination of appropriate sanctions, including jail time, pursuant to chapter 22
18 of NRS. **If you are the Respondent and are Ordered to Show Cause, failure to**
19 **participate in your hearing may result in the Court issuing a Bench Warrant**
20 **for your arrest.**

21 ☐ The Respondent's Request to Quash Bench Warrant.

22 ☐ The Respondent's/Petitioner's Request to address:

23 ☐ arrears ☐ the whereabouts of the minor child(ren) from
24 (month/year) __ through __ (month/year). See attached proof/receipts, if any.

25 ☒ Other: Notification for upcoming motion hearing to be conduted by
26 BlueJeans Telephonic Hearing.
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

☐ **This is a Modification Hearing** pursuant to the Notice of Motion to Modify or Notice and Finding filed contemporaneously with this Notice of Hearing.

The request for this hearing, if any, is attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof.

If you do not participate by BlueJeans, the hearing will proceed in your absence, and an Order and Judgment may be entered against you. You should provide any records to DAFS that you believe are relevant to your case prior to the hearing (such as paycheck stubs, other proof of income, information regarding the cost of dependent health insurance coverage, court orders or birth certificates of other children you are legally responsible to support, proof of prior direct payments).

Dated this June 3, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ P. Morgan

Employee, District Attorney's Office
Family Support Division

1 **AUDIO/VISUAL APPEARANCE INSTRUCTIONS**

2 **Due to COVID-19 and Governor Sisolak’s social distancing mandate, all court**
3 **hearings will be conducted by Audio/Visual Appearance. YOUR PRESENCE IS**
4 **NECESSARY. If you are the Respondent and are Ordered to Show Cause, failure to**
5 **participate in your hearing may result in the Court issuing a Bench Warrant for**
6 **your arrest.**

7 **Please note that some cases may take longer than others and there is a possibility the**
8 **website may drop your video/telephonic appearance before your case is called. If**
9 **this occurs, please be patient and log back in to BlueJeans and re-enter your**
10 **meeting ID number. The Court will call your case when it is ready to go on the**
11 **record. Please remain on mute until the case is called.**

12 **Go to: <https://www.bluejeans.com>**

13 **Meeting No. 651 753 846**

14 **(no passcode)**

15 **Or**

16 **Phone Dial-in**

17 **1 (408) 419-1715**

18 **Meeting No. 651 753 846**

19 **(no passcode)**

20 **Failure to take part in your hearing may result in the Court entering an order without you.**
21 **If you intend to offer exhibits for the hearing, please provide them to this office at least**
22 **10 days before the scheduled hearing. You may deliver them in person or fax them to**
23 **(702) 366-2410. You must print your name, docket “R” number, and UPI case number on**
24 **any exhibits, and direct them to the attention of your assigned case manager.**

REMOTE HEARING PROCESS

Due to COVID-19 many courtrooms are closed, and most court hearings are now *remote*. That means some or all of the people participate by video or by phone. Read below to know how to prepare for a remote appearance.

AUDIO/VISUAL APPEARANCE

- ❖ You may either visit the website noted on page one of this Notice and enter the Meeting ID or you may download the BlueJeans Application.
- ❖ If you are appearing by video, you will also type in your name so the Court can identify who you are when you log into the hearing.
- ❖ When you first log in for your hearing by video, you may see a black room.
- ❖ Once the Court is ready for your case, you will be told to unmute and you will have video access to the Courtroom if appearing by video.
- ❖ Make sure you have a good internet connection. If you do not, appear by telephone only (see instructions below).

TELEPHONIC ONLY APPEARANCE

- ❖ You may appear by phone only by calling the number noted on page one of this Notice and enter the Meeting ID.
- ❖ You do NOT need to set up an account.
- ❖ If you are appearing by phone only, your telephone number will be the only way the Court can identify you.
- ❖ If your number needs to be kept confidential from the other party, use *67 before you call the BlueJeans application so your number does not appear.
- ❖ When you reach the Court, the Court's Marshall will ask you to identify yourself so the Court knows who is present for the hearing. You may be asked more than once as there may be more than one person appearing confidentially.

1 **PLEASE MUTE YOURSELF UNTIL THE MARSHALL ASKS YOU TO**
2 **UNMUTE YOURSELF.**

3 If you are entering the hearing by telephone, you may hear other participants
4 who are waiting for their hearing. This is the waiting room where you will be on hold
5 until the Court is ready for your case.

6 The Marshall will let you know when your case is close to being called.
7

8 **If the Court is running late (by more than 30 minutes, for example) you may**
9 **get automatically disconnected by BlueJeans. If this happens, please log back**
10 **in or call back in. The Court will not proceed without you if you have already**
11 **checked in with the Marshall, but it is your responsibility to check in at the**
12 **time your hearing is scheduled.**

13 **IMPORTANT: You may be connecting from home, but it is still a court hearing.**

14 **Pay attention, and follow all rules.**

15 //

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26

27

28

1 CERT

Case no. 06R136990

2 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

3 The NOTICE OF AUDIO/VISUAL HEARING was served upon KORI
4 LOVETT CAGE by mailing a copy thereof, first class mail, postage prepaid to:

5 KORI LOVETT CAGE
6 8655 ROWLAND BLUFF AVE
7 LAS VEGAS, NV 89178
8
9

10 on June 3, 2021.

11 /s/ P. Morgan

12 Employee, District Attorney's Office
13 Family Support Division
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 CERT

Case no. 06R136990

2 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

3 The NOTICE OF AUDIO/VISUAL HEARING was served upon MALIKA
4 COPPEDGE by mailing a copy thereof, first class mail, postage prepaid to:

5 LEAH BLAKESLEY ESQ
6 725 SOUTH 8TH STREET
7 SUITE 100
8 LAS VEGAS, NV 89101
9

10 on June 3, 2021.
11

12 /s/ P. Morgan

13 Employee, District Attorney's Office
14 Family Support Division
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



1 **OPPC**

2 **GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM**

3 Nedda Ghandi, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 11137

4 Email: nedda@ghandilaw.com

Brian E. Blackham, Esq.

5 Nevada Bar No. 9974

Email: brian@ghandilaw.com

6 725 South 8th Street, Suite 100

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

7 Telephone: (702) 878-1115

Facsimile: (702) 979-2485

Attorneys for Defendant

8 **EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

9 **FAMILY DIVISION**

10 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

11 Nevada Dept. Of Health & Human
Services, Div. Of Welfare &
12 Supportive Services, And Malika
Coppedge,

13 **Petitioner,**

14 **v.**

15 **Kori L. Cage,**

16 **Respondent.**

Case No.: 06R136990

Corresponding Case No. D374223

Dept. No: Child Support

Corresponding Dept. No.: J

Date of Hearing: June 29, 2021

Time of Hearing: 2:30 p.m.

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED: NO


17 **OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER**
18 **PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY'S FEES AND ADOPTION OF MASTERS**
19 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OCTOBER 27, 2020, HEARING**
20 **AND COUNTERMOTION TO VACATE THE HEARING, DEEM KORI**
A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT, AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND
COSTS

1 Defendant Malika Coppedge ("Malika"), by and through her attorney of
2 record, Brian E. Blackham, Esq., of GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM, hereby
3 submits her Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration and
4 Countermotion to Vacate the Hearing, to Deem Kori a Vexatious Litigant, and for
5 Attorney's Fees and Costs (Opposition and Countermotion).

6 This Opposition and Countermotion is based upon the Points and
7 Authorities below, the attached Declaration of Malika, any and all pleadings and
8 papers on file in this matter, and any oral representation to take place at the hearing
9 of this Opposition and Countermotion.

10 DATED this 8th day of June 2021.

11 **GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM**

12 

13 _____
14 Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
15 Nevada Bar No. 9974
16 725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
18 Attorney for Defendant
19
20

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I.**

3 **RELEVANT FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

4 1. Malika and Respondent Kori Cage (Kori) were never married.
5 However, there are two minor children the issue of their relationship, to wit: Kyree
6 Lovett Cage (Kyree), born December 3, 2004, and Jayla Nicole Cage (Jayla), born
7 February 20, 2007.

8 2. Pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and
9 Orders (FFCLJ), entered by the District Court in Case No. D-07-374223-P on April
10 23, 2018, Malika was awarded primary physical custody of the minor children,
11 subject to Kori's right to specified visitation.

12 3. Based on the custodial timeshare, and Kori's reported income of
13 \$3,262.44 Malika was awarded child support in the amount of \$815.61, due on the
14 first day of each month. Kori was ordered to maintain health insurance for the
15 minor children, with the parties sharing equally in the cost of unreimbursed medical
16 expenses.

17 4. After the entry of the FFCLJ, Kori requested that his child support
18 obligation be modified and/or suspended based on his termination in employment.

19 5. On December 13, 2019, a hearing was held regarding Kori's request
20 to modify and/or suspended his child support obligation. The Hearing Master issued

1 the following recommendations, which this Court affirmed and adopted as the
2 Order of this Court¹:

- 3 • Temporarily the Court will permit a \$65 per child per month
4 downward deviation for a total monthly support of \$323.00,
5 Effective December 1, 2019, until further order;
- 6 • Until the Court is clear on the remitter issue or until further
7 order, the underlying amount remains unchanged, but any
8 permanent modification will be as of December 1, 2019;
- 9 • The Court set no arrears at this time, pending the next Court
10 date;
- 11 • This Order is temporary per stipulation of the parties pending
12 the next Court date;
- 13 • The D case to be consulted for any new Orders regarding the
14 impact of the portion that was remanded;
- 15 • The issues that have been raised in the Motion and
16 Countermotion are still ripe for determination; and
- 17 • A hearing date was scheduled for March 13, 2020.

18 ///

20 ¹ See, Master's Recommendations filed on 01/07/2020.

1 6. On March 13, 2020, the hearing was held regarding issues still ripe for
2 determination mainly, the status of Kori's appeal and the issue of child support
3 arrears. The Court was advised that Kori's appeal was denied however, the Court's
4 Order holding Malika's prior child support obligation in abeyance, an issue
5 collateral to the issues presently before the Court, was reversed and remanded to
6 the District Court. At the time of hearing, a remittitur had still not issued in the
7 District Court case. The District Attorney advised the Court that Kori had
8 outstanding child support arrears in the amount of \$2,729.18, which were
9 intercepted from Kori's 2019 tax return. The Court inquired as to the status of Kori's
10 employment and employment efforts, and Kori advised he was still unemployed
11 and receiving unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1,811.00 per month. The
12 District Attorney advised that Kori's unemployment benefits were expected to
13 conclude in September 2020 and, as such, the Court set a Status Check Hearing for
14 September 25, 2020 (subsequently reset to September 22, 2020 at 9:30 a.m.) and
15 issued the following recommendations, which the Court affirmed and adopted as
16 the Order of this Court²:

- 17 • The Court denied Kori's request for a further reduction in child
18 support based on the relative income of the parties;

19
20 ² See, Master's Recommendations, entered July 14, 2020.

- The Court denied Kori's request to retroactively apply his modified child support obligation to a date prior to the filing of his Motion to Modify;
- The Court denied Malika's request for attorney's fees and costs;
- The Court ordered Kori's child support obligation to Malika to remain at \$323.00 per month, due on the first of each month, which was effective December 1, 2019 based on Kori's underlying modification request; and
- The Court ordered Kori to provide the District attorney with a copy of the minor children's Medicaid insurance cards by April 13, 2020.

7. On March 23, 2020, Kori filed an Objection to the Hearing Master's Recommendations.

8. On June 3, 2020³ an in chambers hearing was held on Kori's Objection to the Hearing Master's Recommendations, and Malika's Response thereto. The Court found "no clear error" in the Hearing Master's Recommendation affirmed the Master's Recommendation, and denied Kori's objection.⁴

³ It must be noted that although this in-chambers hearing was set for June 3, 2020, the result of said hearing was not available until after the July 6, 2020, status check.

⁴ See, June 3, 2020, Minute Order.

1 9. On July 6, 2020, a status check was held on Kori's prior Motion for
2 Review and Adjustment of Child Support, and a status on Kori's underlying District
3 Court Objection. At the time of the hearing, the underlying Objection, pending in
4 the District Court, had not yet been heard. As such, the Court maintained the status
5 quo, unless otherwise modified by the District Court at the hearing on Kori's
6 objection.⁵ The Court also provided Kori an additional ten (10) days to provide the
7 children's Medicaid cards to Malika, as previously ordered by the Court, and
8 continued the hearing until September 25, 2020.⁶

9 10. On July 21, 2020, Kori filed another Objection to the Hearing Master's
10 Recommendations.

11 11. On September 16, 2020⁷ an in chambers hearing was held on Kori's
12 Objection to the Hearing Master's Recommendations, and Malika's Response
13 thereto. The Court found "no clear error" in the Hearing Master's Recommendation,
14 affirmed the Master's Recommendation, and denied Kori's objection.⁸

15 ///

16 ///

17
18 ⁵ See, Master's Recommendations entered July 28, 2020.

19 ⁶ *Id.* This hearing was subsequently reset to September 22, 2020, at 9:30 a.m. due to the shift to
the four-day work week after the onset of the Covid 19 pandemic.

20 ⁷ It must be noted that although this in chambers hearing was set for June 3, 2020, the result of
said hearing was not available until after the July 6, 2020, status check.

⁸ See June 3, 2020, Minute Order.

1 12. On September 22, 2020, the status check previously set at the hearing
2 held on July 6, 2020, was continued to October 27, 2020 due to short notice of the
3 hearing date which was moved from September 25, 2020 to September 22, 2020.

4 13. On October 27, 2020, a status check was held on Kori's prior Motion
5 for Review and Adjustment of Child Support. At the time of hearing, the Court
6 found Kori's gross monthly income was \$1,811.33, which comprised of
7 unemployment benefits. Based on this income, the Court modified Kori's child
8 support obligation to \$268.00, effective October 1, 2020.⁹ The Court further ordered
9 Kori to continue maintaining health insurance for the minor children.¹⁰

10 14. On November 30, 2020, Kori filed *another* Objection to the Hearing
11 Master's Recommendations.

12 15. On January 7, 2021, the District Attorney ("DA") filed a response to
13 Kori's Objection.

14 16. On January 22, 2021, Malika filed her response to Kori's Objection,
15 and a Countermotion for Attorney's Fees and Costs.

16 17. On February 23, 2021, Kori filed his Reply to both Malika's and the
17 DA's responses.

18 ///

19 _____
20 ⁹ See, Master's Recommendation, entered November 30, 2020.

¹⁰ *Id.*

1 18. The hearing on Kori's Objection, the DA's response, and Malika's
2 response and countermotion was held in-chambers, on March 17, 2021.

3 19. Pursuant to the Order entered May 11, 2021, from the in chambers
4 hearing held on March 17, 2021, the Court noted, found, and ordered the following,
5 in pertinent part:

- 6 • Per NRS 425.3844(2),; a recommendation entered by a master must
7 be furnished to each party at the conclusion of the proceedings or as
8 soon thereafter as possible. Within ten (10) days after receipt of the
9 recommendation, any party may file with the District Court and
10 serve upon the other parties a notice of objection to the
11 recommendation. Pursuant to NRS 425.3844(3) if the objection is
12 not filed within 10 days of receipt of the recommendation, the
13 recommendation entered by the master shall be deemed approved
14 by the District Court, and the clerk of the District Court may file the
15 recommendation and judgement may be entered. Here, the Master s
16 Recommendation based on the October 27, 2020 hearing was filed
17 by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020. No
18 objection had been filed by date. On November 30, 2020, eleven
19 (11) days after the Recommendation was filed by the clerk of the
20 District Court and deemed approved by the District Court,
Respondent Cage filed his Objection to the Recommendation.
- EDCR 1.40(e) addresses Child Support Masters specifically.
Accordingly, either party has ten (10) days after the conclusion of
the proceeding and receipt of the report to **file and serve** an objection
to recommendations of child support masters. [emphasis supplied]
- Per NRCP 53(f)(1)(A), a party may **file and serve** objections to
masters report and recommendations (generally) within fourteen
(14) days. [emphasis supplied]
- NRCP 6(a)(1)(B) addresses the computation of time for filing
motion papers. Parties are to exclude the day of the event that

1 triggers the period, count every day, including intermediate
2 weekends and holidays. Respondent Cage argues that his Objection
was filed timely.

- 3 • THIS COURT FINDS that Respondent's argument that the October
4 27, 2020 hearing date must be excluding when calculating time is
correct.
- 5 • THIS COURT FINDS that Respondent's argument that the parties
6 should acknowledge time for receipt of the Recommendation sent to
7 him via mail and time for the clerk of the District Court to receive
8 his Objection mailed to the court is persuasive and correct.
9 However, considering all arguments regarding whether
Respondent's Objection was filed timely, the deadline to file an
Objection was November 6, 2020 per the ten (10) day rule. Even
allowing for the fourteen (14) day rule, the deadline would have
been November 10, 2020.
- 10 • Furthermore, giving Respondent grace regarding potential delays in
11 receipt of the Recommendation via mail and mailing his Objection,
12 the clerk filed the Recommendation on November 19, 2020, thirteen
13 (13) days after the ten (10) day deadline and nine (9) days after the
14 fourteen (14) day deadline. Even giving Respondent Cage three or
15 four days for possible mail delays each way, the Objection was not
16 filed until November 30, 2020. The November 30, 2020 date is
twenty-four (24) days beyond the ten (10) day deadline and twenty
17 (20) days beyond the 14-day deadline. Respondent Cage has filed
18 numerous pleadings in this matter since 2019, including pleadings
19 to the Supreme Court of Nevada. ***Respondent is aware of filing
20 deadlines and must adhere to them.*** [emphasis supplied]
- THIS COURT FINDS that Respondent Cage's Objection was filed
untimely and will not be considered.
- Furthermore, per NRCP 53(e)(2) and EDCR 1.40(d), the District
Court SHALL accept the Master's Recommendations unless clearly
erroneous. The clearly erroneous standard of review generally
means that the reviewing court must have a definite and firm

1 conviction that a mistake was committed. No such finding can be
2 made here. Lastly, Petitioner Coppedge alleges that Respondent
3 Cage has increased litigation costs which caused a financial burden
4 and forced her to incur unnecessary attorney s fees and costs.
Respondent as filed at least three objections. Two prior objections
were denied and now this objection filed untimely is DENIED.

- 5 • THIS COURT ORDERS that Petitioner s request for attorney s fees
and costs is GRANTED. Counsel for Petitioner shall file a
6 Memorandum of Fees and Costs, submit an unredacted billing
statement to Chambers, and submit a corresponding Order for
7 Attorney s Fees and Costs.
- 8 • IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Master's Recommendation
from the October 27, 2020 hearing, filed by the clerk of the District
9 Court on November 19, 2020, SHALL be affirmed and adopted.
DAFS shall submit the Order with the appropriate findings.¹¹

10 20. On or about May 6, 2021, undersigned counsel received Kori's Motion
11 to Reconsider Petitioners Attorney's Fees and Adoption of Masters
12 recommendations from the October 27, 2020 Hearing ("Motion"). Kori's Motion
13 had not been filed, there was no hearing scheduled, although Kori dated his Motion
14 "April 30, 2021". Kori alleges his underlying Objection was in fact timely pursuant
15 to NRS 238.100.

16 21. In its lengthy order entered May 11, 2021, this Court already found
17 and held that Kori's Objection was not filed timely, as required by the governing
18 rules of this Court and Kori's attempt to persuade the Court otherwise, by filing
19

20 ¹¹ See Order entered May 11, 2021.

1 *another* pleading requiring a response, is nothing more than a vexatious attempt to
2 increase litigation costs in this matter.

3 22. Likewise, Kori's recent Motion demands that Malika submit
4 "unredacted billing statements" in support of her Memorandum of Attorney's Fees
5 and Costs is likewise vexatious, as this is already an order of the Court.

6 23. Based upon the above facts and the arguments set forth below, Malika
7 requests that this Court deny Kori's Motion in its entirety, vacate the hearing on this
8 matter, deem Kori to be a vexatious litigant, and award Malika additional attorney's
9 fees and costs for being forced to file this Opposition and Countermotion.

10 II.

11 OPPOSITION AND COUNTERMOTION

12 A. The Hearing In This Matter Must Be Vacated Because Kori's Motion For 13 Reconsideration Is Without Basis.

14 The underlying Order was entered on May 11, 2021, and Kori's Motion was
15 filed on May 25, 2021, and thus Kori's Motion for Reconsideration is technically
16 filed timely however, Malika disputes that it is warranted as further described
17 below.

18 Kori has provided no substantive basis for yet another reconsideration of the
19 Court's ruling concerning the Master's Recommendation from the October 27,
20 2020. This Court has previously considered Kori's arguments in regards to the

1 Master's Recommendation, and found them to be without merit. Not once, not
2 twice, by on all three occasions in which Kori has objected to the Master's
3 Recommendations throughout the past year. Kori's continued abuse of the legal
4 process must not be allowed to continue.

5 Kori relies on NRS 238.100 in support of his argument for reconsideration
6 for the notion that his prior objection was in fact timely. NRS 238.100 states the
7 following:

8 NRS 238.100 Date of postmark deemed date of filing or payment.

9 1. Except as provided in subsections 2 and 4, or by specific statute,
10 any document or payment required or permitted by law or regulation to
be filed or made by mailing to the State or any of its agencies or political
subdivisions shall be deemed filed or made on the date of the postmark
dated by the post office on the envelope in which it was mailed.

11 2. If a document or payment was mailed but not received by the
12 addressee or was received but the postmarked date is illegible or
omitted, the document or payment shall be deemed filed or made on the
date it was mailed, if the sender:

13 (a) Establishes by a postal receipt for registered or certified mail that
14 the mailing date was on or before the required date for filing or payment;
and

15 (b) Where the document or payment was not received, files a duplicate
of the contents of the envelope within 15 days after the sender becomes
aware that it was not received.

16 3. For the purposes of this section, if the required date for filing or
17 making payment is a Saturday, Sunday or legal holiday, the filing or
payment is timely if performed on the next day which is not a Saturday,
Sunday or legal holiday.

18 4. This section does not apply to the filing of documents pursuant
to NRS 225.085 or title 24 of NRS.

19 (Added to NRS by 1975, 751; A 1983, 1382; 2003, 1953)
20

1 As previously mentioned, this Court already found Kori's objection untimely
2 pursuant to NRS 425.3844(3), EDCR 1.40(e), NRCP 53(f)(1)(A), and NRCP
3 6(a)(1)(B), the statutes, Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure, and Eighth Judicial
4 District Court rules applicable to the filing of Kori's prior objection. As such, Kori's
5 attempt to reargue the timing of his prior Objection is not only moot, it is without
6 merit. More importantly, NRS 238.100 is completely inapplicable to the filing of
7 Kori's prior Objection and instead pleadings and instead, is only relevant to "legal
8 notices and advertisements." In fact, NRS 238.100 is located within Title 19:
9 Miscellaneous Matters Related to Government and Public Affairs (not at all relevant
10 to the underlying pleadings), Chapter 28, Legal Notices and Advertisements,
11 subsection "use of mail for filing and payment". The rules previously cited by this
12 Court, notably NRS 425.3844(3), EDCR 1.40(e), NRCP 53(f)(1)(A), and NRCP
13 6(a)(1)(B) are controlling on the issue of the *filing and service* timing of Kori's
14 Objection, not NRS 238.100. As such, Kori has provided no viable argument in
15 support of his motion for reconsideration of the timeliness of his prior Objection.

16 As to Kori's request that the Court require undersigned counsel to provide
17 unredacted billing statements for purposes of Malika's Memorandum of Attorney's
18 Fees and Costs, again, this is already an order of the Court. Specifically, the Court
19 ordered:

20 ///

1 THIS COURT ORDERS that Petitioner s request for attorney s fees
2 and costs is GRANTED. Counsel for Petitioner shall file a
3 Memorandum of Fees and Costs, submit an **unredacted billing**
statement to Chambers, and submit a corresponding Order for
Attorney s Fees and Costs.¹²

4 Given this is already an order of the Court, Kori is again arguing, simply for
5 the sake of arguing and to increase litigation costs to Malika.

6 Likewise, this Court made findings in support of its award of attorney's fees
7 and costs to Malika. Specifically, the Court found that not only was Kori's
8 Objection untimely and thus, not considered by the Court, the Master's
9 Recommendations were not clearly erroneous.¹³ The Court granted Malika's
10 request for an award of attorney's fees and costs due to Kori repeatedly increasing
11 the costs of litigation by filing three Objections, all of which were denied.¹⁴
12 Certainly it is Kori's right to file whatever he wants. However, those filings must
13 be brought for a proper purpose and not simply meant to harass, which is exactly
14 what Kori's prior pleadings were clearly intended to do.

15 As such, Kori's meritless motion to reconsider should be denied.

16 ///

17 ///

18

19 ¹² See Order entered May 11, 2021, p. 5, lines 5-10.

20 ¹³ See Order entered May 11, 2021 at p. 4, lines 15-22.

¹⁴ *Id.* at lines 22-26. See also p. 5, lines 1-10.

1 **C. Kori Should Be Deemed a Vexatious Litigant.**

2 Malika cannot afford to be dragged back to Court each time Kori throws a
3 temper tantrum over his court-ordered obligations. This Court, in its Order entered
4 May 11, 2021 even noted that “Respondent Cage has filed numerous pleadings in
5 this matter since 2019, including pleadings to the Supreme Court of Nevada”¹⁵ and
6 as such, this Court is clearly aware of Kori’s litigious nature. Since the Decision
7 and Order issued by this Court on April 23, 2018, Malika has been forced to oppose
8 an appeal, attend a disqualification hearing for the Honorable Judge Hughes, and
9 respond to three frivolous Objections, and now, the instant Motion, all of which
10 were found to be without merit. Each time, Malika was forced to incur thousands
11 of dollars that she does not have fighting Kori’s baseless requests. Although this
12 Court has clearly attempted to mitigate this injustice by awarding Malika some of
13 her attorney’s fees and costs, the fact remains that Malika must still front the costs
14 of her defense and then try to collect any fee award from Kori, which has been
15 impossible. Since the award of attorney’s fees clearly has not dissuaded Kori from
16 litigating and re-litigating his baseless claims, more proactive measures are in order.

17 NSCR 9.5 was specifically designed to curb the conduct of vexatious litigants
18 as follows:
19

20 ¹⁵ *Id.* at p. 4, lines 10-13.

1 **Purpose and procedure.** The administrative office of the
2 courts shall maintain for use by the judicial council and the
3 courts of the state a list of litigants that have been declared as
 vexatious by any court, at any level of jurisdiction, throughout
 the state:

4 (a) Each court shall, upon entering an order declaring a litigant
5 to be vexatious, submit a copy of the order to the director of the
 administrative office of courts or his or her designee.

6 (b) The director or designee shall enter the name of the litigant
7 identified in the aforementioned order on a list of vexatious
8 litigants and post the list in such a place so that it will be readily
 accessible to the various courts. The director or designee shall
 maintain the list in good order.

9 (c) If a court takes any action that affects the status of a litigant
10 declared vexatious, the court shall forward record of that action
 to the director or designee forthwith for amendment of the list.

11 As the Court is aware, Kori has previously engaged in frivolous and
12 unwarranted litigation. Kori has continued to engage in bad faith conduct, has
13 attempted to revive claims that were previously denied and has presently filed a
14 factual defective motion that clearly violates the rules of this Court. Kori's ongoing
15 bad-faith, over-litigious conduct is the very definition of over-litigious vexatious
16 litigation.

17 Based upon Kori's ongoing bad-faith, over-litigious, and vexatious conduct,
18 Malika requests that he be included in the State of Nevada's list of litigants that
19 have been declared as vexatious by the Courts, and that Kori be forced to seek leave
20 of Court before filing any further motions in this case.

1 **D. Malika Should Be Awarded Her Attorney's Fees and Costs for Being**
2 **Forced to Respond to this Frivolous Motion.**

3 NRS 18.010 provides in pertinent part as follows:

4 1. The compensation of an attorney and counselor for his
5 services is governed by agreement, express or implied, which
6 is not restrained by law.

7 2. In addition to the cases where an allowance is authorized by
8 specific statute, the court may make an allowance of attorney's
9 fees to a prevailing party:

10 (a) When he has not recovered more than \$20,000; or

11 (b) Without regard to the recovery sought, when the court finds
12 that the claim, counterclaim, cross-claim or third-party
13 complaint or defense of the opposing party was brought or
14 maintained without reasonable ground or to harass the
15 prevailing party. The court shall liberally construe the
16 provisions of this paragraph in favor of awarding attorney's fees
17 in all appropriate situations. It is the intent of the Legislature
18 that the court award attorney's fees pursuant to this paragraph
19 and impose sanctions pursuant to Rule 11 of the Nevada Rules
20 of Civil Procedure in all appropriate situations to punish for and
deter frivolous or vexatious claims and defenses because such
claims and defenses overburden limited judicial resources,
hinder the timely resolution of meritorious claims and increase
the costs of engaging in business and providing professional
services to the public.

Furthermore, EDCR 7.60(b) states as follows:

The court may, after notice and an opportunity to be heard,
impose upon an attorney or a party any and all sanctions which
may, under the facts of the case, be reasonable, including the
imposition of fines, costs or attorney's fees when an attorney or
a party without just cause:

1 **(1) Presents to the court a motion or an opposition to**
2 **a motion which is obviously frivolous, unnecessary or**
3 **unwarranted.**

4 (2) Fails to prepare for a presentation.

5 **(3) So multiplies the proceedings in a case as to**
6 **increase costs unreasonably and vexatiously.**

7 (4) Fails or refuses to comply with these rules.

8 (5) Fails or refuses to comply with any order of a judge
9 of the court.

10 With specific reference to Family Law matters, the Court has adopted
11 “well-known basic elements,” which in addition to hourly time schedules kept by
12 the attorney, are to be considered in determining the reasonable value of an
13 attorney’s services qualities, commonly referred to as the Brunzell factors.
14 Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969).

15 1. *The Qualities of the Advocate*: his/her ability, his/her training,
16 education, experience, professional standing and skill.

17 2. *The Character of the Work to Be Done*: its difficulty, its intricacy, its
18 importance, time and skill required, the responsibility imposed and the
19 prominence and character of the parties where they affect the importance
20 of the litigation.

 3. *The Work Actually Performed by the Lawyer*: the skill, time and
 attention given to the work.

1 4. *The Result*: whether the attorney was successful and what benefits
2 were derived.

3 Each of these factors should be given consideration, and no one element
4 should predominate or be given undue weight. Miller v. Wilfong, 121 Nev. 619,
5 119 P.3d 727 (2005). Additional guidance is provided by reviewing the
6 “attorney’s fees” cases most often cited in Family Law. Fletcher v. Fletcher, 89
7 Nev. 540, 516 P.2d 103 (1973); Levy v. Levy, 96 Nev. 902, 620 P.2d 860 (1980),
8 Hybarger v. Hybarger, 103 Nev. 255, 737 P.2d 889 (1987). The Brunzell factors
9 require counsel to make a representation as to the “qualities of the advocate,” the
10 character and difficulty of the work performed, and the work *actually* performed
11 by the attorney.

12 First, respectfully, we suggest that undersigned counsel is A/V rated and a
13 Certified Specialist in Nevada family law and has practiced primarily in the area of
14 family law for over eleven years. As to the “character and quality of the work
15 performed,” we ask the Court to find our work in this matter to have been adequate,
16 both factually and legally; we have diligently reviewed the applicable law, explored
17 the relevant facts, and believe that we have properly applied one to the other.
18 Finally, as to the result reached, this remains to be determined when the Court rules
19 on the present Opposition and Counter-motion.

1 Malika has once again been forced to incur substantial attorney's fees and
2 costs in defending against Kori's present Motion, which is obviously frivolous,
3 unnecessary and unwarranted based on this Court's previous findings and orders
4 concerning the exact same issues. As such, Kori has continuously multiplied the
5 proceedings in this case, unreasonably and vexatiously increasing the costs, to
6 which Kori alone should be made to bear the cost. Accordingly, Malika should be
7 awarded her attorney's fees and costs in the amount of \$5,000.00 for being forced
8 to file the instant Opposition and Countermotion.

9 **III.**

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 Based upon the facts set forth herein, Malika hereby asks that the Court
12 issue an Order granting her the following relief:

- 13 1. Denying Kori's Motion in its entirety and vacating the hearing in this
14 matter;
- 15 2. Deeming Kori a vexatious litigant;
- 16 3. Awarding Malika her attorney's fees and costs in the amount of
17 \$5,000.00 for being forced to file the instant Opposition and
18 Countermotion; and

19 ///

20 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

4. For such other and further relief this Court deems just and proper in
the premises.

DATED this 8th day of June 2021.

GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM



Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9974
725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Plaintiff


1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify on the 8th day of June, 20121, a true and correct copy of the
3 foregoing OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER
4 PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY'S FEES AND ADOPTION OF MASTERS
5 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OCTOBER 27, 2020, HEARING AND
6 COUNTERMOTION TO VACATE THE HEARING, DEEM KORI A
7 VEXATIOUS LITIGATION, AND FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS,
8 was served upon the following parties to the following address:

- 9 ☒ Electronic Service to: DAFS: DAFSLegalGroup@clarkcountynvda.com
10 ☐ Via Facsimile to:
11 ☐ Via Email to:
☒ Placing in the U.S. Mail, with postage fully prepaid, addressed to:

12 Steven B. Wolfson, DA
13 Family Support Division
14 1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Kori Cage
8655 Rowland Bluff Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89178
Respondent

15 
16 _____
An employee of Ghandi Deeter Blackham

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Electronically Filed
6/8/2021 10:40 AM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT



Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
vs.
Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

Case No.: 06R136990
Department: Child Support

NOTICE OF HEARING

Please be advised that the OPPOSITION in the above-entitled matter is set for hearing as follows:

Date: June 29, 2021
Time: 2:30 PM
Location: Greystone Courtroom #1
1900 E. Flamingo Rd #100
Las Vegas, NV 89119

NOTE: Under NEFCR 9(d), if a party is not receiving electronic service through the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing System, the movant requesting a hearing must serve this notice on the party by traditional means.

STEVEN D. GRIERSON, CEO/Clerk of the Court

By: /s/ M Hughes
Deputy Clerk of the Court

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that pursuant to Rule 9(b) of the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules a copy of this Notice of Hearing was electronically served to all registered users on this case in the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing System.

By: /s/ M Hughes
Deputy Clerk of the Court

572

1 I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada, and a
2 principle of GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM, the attorneys of record for
3 Defendant Malika Coppedge (Malika), in this action.

4 This Memorandum of Attorney's Fees and Costs (Memorandum) is being
5 made pursuant to NRS 18.010(2), EDCR 7.60(b), NRS 125B.140, and in
6 conjunction with the Court's directive at the in chambers March 17, 2021 hearing
7 in this matter.

8 The billing statement attached as Exhibit 1 accurately reflects the services
9 provided by this firm in the above-entitled case. Based upon such billings, Malika
10 has incurred the total sum of \$1,301.00 in attorney's fees and costs for the
11 preparation, and other tasks related to Malika's Response to Kori's Objection and
12 Appeal of the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations and Counter-motion to
13 Adopt Master's Recommendations in Full, and for Attorney's Fees and Costs filed
14 January 22, 2021 and the instant Memorandum¹. In its Order entered May 11, 2021,
15 the Court found Kori's Objection to the October 27, 2020 Master's
16 Recommendation was untimely, and that the Master's Recommendation was not
17 clearly erroneous. As such, the Court affirmed and adopted the Master's

18 ¹ The Court requested unredacted billing statements reflecting the fees and costs incurred as they
19 relate *only* to the filing of Malika's response, filed on January 22, 2021, to Kori's third Objection.
20 Given the billing statement included contains entries for tasks unrelated to the filing of Malika's
response to Kori's third objection, as there are ongoing Supreme Court appeals and other issues
in this matter, those portions of the billing statement were redacted in their entirety.

1 Recommendation from the October 27, 2020. The Court further found that by
2 untimely filing his Objection, Kori forced Malika to incur the costs of filing a
3 response. Additionally, because Kori unsuccessfully filed two prior objections to
4 Master's Recommendations, which were also denied, Kori increased litigation
5 costs, causing a financial burden to Malika in forcing her to incur unnecessary
6 attorney's fees and costs.

7 Work performed on Malika's case that is unrelated to Malika's Response to
8 Kori's Objection and Appeal of the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations
9 and Countermotion to Adopt Master's Recommendations in Full, and for
10 Attorney's Fees and Costs filed January 22, 2021, the instant Memorandum, and
11 any of the requests for relief contained therein, are not included this total.

12 ///

13 ///

14 ///

15

16

17

18

19

20


1 As shown in the analysis set forth below, the fees charged by GHANDI
2 DEETER BLACKHAM are reasonable under the standards set forth by the Nevada
3 Supreme Court in *Brunzell*² and *Wilfong*.³


4 Pursuant to the Court's directive, I served Plaintiff Kori Cage (Kori), with a
5 copy of the Memorandum.

6 DATED this 11th day of June, 2021.

7 
Brian E. Blackham, Esq.

8 SIGNED and SWORN to before me
9 this 11th day of June, 2021.

10 
11 NOTARY PUBLIC In and For
12 Said County and State



19
20 ² *Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank*, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969).
³ *Miller v. Wilfong*, 121 Nev. 619, 119 P.3d 727 (2005).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

I.
BACKGROUND

On November 30, 2020, Kori filed an Objection and Appeal of the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations (Objection). On January 7, 2021, the District Attorney (DA) filed its Opposition to Kori's Objection. On January 22, 2021, Malika filed her Response to Kori's Objection and Appeal of the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations and Countermotion to Adopt Master's Recommendations in Full, and for Attorney's Fees and Costs. An in chambers hearing was held on Kori's Objection, the DA's Opposition, and Malika's Opposition on March 17, 2021, and a minute order was issued regarding the same on April 21, 2021.

The Court found that, not only was Kori's Objection untimely, it lacked merit and the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendation was not clearly erroneous. As such, the Court affirmed and adopted the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendation and awarded Malika her attorney's fees and costs incurred FOR being forced to respond to Kori's untimely and meritless objection, in addition to the two prior Objections Kori filed, which were both denied. The Court ordered Malika to submit the instant Memorandum to determine the award of Malika's attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing forth the underlying Response to Kori's Objection and Appeal of the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations

1 and Countermotion to Adopt Master's Recommendations in Full, and for
2 Attorney's Fees and Costs. As such, Malika is submitting her Memorandum,
3 including billing statements showing the work performed on behalf of Malika as it
4 relates to the filing of her Response to Kori's Objection and Appeal of the October
5 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations and Countermotion to Adopt Master's
6 Recommendations in Full, and for Attorney's Fees and Costs filed January 22,
7 2021, the instant Memorandum, and the charges incurred for the same.

8 As stated in the above Affidavit, the billing statement attached as Exhibit 1
9 accurately reflects the services provided by this firm in the above-entitled case.
10 Based upon such billings, Malika has incurred the total sum of \$1,301.00 in
11 attorney's fees and costs for the preparation, and other tasks related to the filing of
12 her Response to Kori's Objection and Appeal of the October 27, 2020 Master's
13 Recommendations and Countermotion to Adopt Master's Recommendations in
14 Full, and for Attorney's Fees and Costs, as to which Malika was the prevailing
15 party.

16 II.

17 LEGAL ARGUMENT

18 Malika should be awarded attorney's fees and costs pursuant to NRS
19 18.010(2) and EDCR 7.60(b) due to Kori's untimely and meritless Objection.
20

1 NRS 18.010 (2) provides as follows:

2 In addition to the cases where an allowance is authorized by
3 specific statute, the court may make an allowance of attorney's
fees to a prevailing party:

4 (a) When he has not recovered more than \$20,000; or

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

8 (Emphasis supplied).

9 EDCR 7.60 states the following:

10 ...

11 (b) The court may, after notice and an opportunity to be heard,
12 impose upon an attorney or a party any and all sanctions which
may, under the facts of the case, be reasonable, including the
13 imposition of fines, costs or attorney's fees when an attorney or
a party without just cause:

14 **(1) Presents to the court a motion or an opposition to**
a motion which is obviously frivolous, unnecessary or
unwarranted.

15 (2) Fails to prepare for a presentation.

16 **(3) So multiplies the proceedings in a case as to**
17 **increase costs unreasonably and vexatiously.**

18 (4) Fails or refuses to comply with these rules.

19 (5) Fails or refuses to comply with any order of a judge
20 of the court.

1 With specific reference to Family Law matters, the Court has adopted “well-
2 known basic elements,” which in addition to hourly time schedules kept by the
3 attorney, are to be considered in determining the reasonable value of an attorney’s
4 services qualities, commonly referred to as the *Brunzell* factors. *Brunzell v. Golden*
5 *Gate National Bank*, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969). These factors are:

6 1. *The Qualities of the Advocate*: his/her ability, his/her training,
7 education, experience, professional standing and skill.

8 2. *The Character of the Work to Be Done*: its difficulty, its
9 intricacy, its importance, time and skill required, the
responsibility imposed and the prominence and character of the
parties where they affect the importance of the litigation.

10 3. *The Work Actually Performed by the Lawyer*: the skill, time
11 and attention given to the work.

12 4. *The Result*: whether the attorney was successful and what
benefits were derived.

13 Each of these factors should be given consideration, and no one element
14 should predominate or be given undue weight. *Miller v. Wilfong*, 121 Nev. 619, 119
15 P.3d 727, 730 (2005). Additional guidance is provided by reviewing the “attorney’s
16 fees” cases most often cited in Family Law. *Fletcher v. Fletcher*, 89 Nev. 540, 516
17 P.2d 103 (1973); *Levy v. Levy*, 96 Nev. 902, 620 P.2d 860 (1980), *Hybarger v.*
18 *Hybarger*, 103 Nev. 255, 737 P.2d 889 (1987). The *Brunzell* factors require counsel
19 to rather immodestly make a representation as to the “qualities of the advocate,” the
20

1 character and difficulty of the work performed, and the work *actually* performed by
2 the attorney.

3 Applying the Brunzell factors, undersigned counsel, Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
4 (“BB”) is A/V rated, a partner of the law firm GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM,
5 and a Certified Specialist in Nevada family law and has practiced primarily in the
6 area of family law for over 15 years. Leah M. Blakesley, Esq. (“LB”), is an
7 associate at GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM, a member in good standing with
8 the Nevada State Bar and has practiced in the area of family law almost exclusively
9 for more than eight years. Theresa Calabrese-Vance (“TCV”), a legal assistant at
10 GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM, has worked in the legal field for more than 23
11 years, has worked specifically in the field of family law for over 15 years, and has
12 significant experience in the legal field, particularly in the areas of case
13 management, filing, client communication, correspondence, and the preparation of
14 pleadings.

15 As to the “character and quality of the work performed,” we ask the Court to
16 find our work in this matter to have been adequate, both factually and legally; we
17 have diligently reviewed the applicable law, explored the relevant facts, and believe
18 that we have properly applied one to the other. Finally, as to the result reached,
19 Malika prevailed on her request that Kori’s request be denied as untimely, that the
20 October 27, 2020 Master’s Recommendation be affirmed and adopted, and that

1 Malika be awarded her attorney's fees and costs for being forced to respond to
2 Kori's underlying Objection. In its minute order filed April 21, 2021, the Court
3 found Kori's Objection untimely, and thus, declined to consider said Objection,
4 affirmed and adopted the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendation, and
5 awarded Malika her attorney's fees and costs for being forced to respond to Kori's
6 meritless Objection, just as she was forced to respond to Kori's two prior
7 Objections. As such, the Court directed counsel to file the instant Memorandum.

8 **III.**

9 **CONCLUSION**

10 As shown in the attached billing statement, Malika has incurred a substantial
11 expense in bringing forth her Response to Kori's Objection and Appeal of the
12 October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations and Countermotion to Adopt
13 Master's Recommendations in Full, and for Attorney's Fees and Costs, and justice
14 requires that she be reimbursed for this expense. Having prevailed before the
15 Court, Malika should be awarded her attorney's fees and costs in the amount of
16 \$1,301.00. This award is necessary both to compensate Malika for the fees and costs
17 actually incurred, and to punish and dissuade Kori from taking unreasonable
18 positions in the future. This sum should be reduced to judgment against Kori and

19 ///

20 ///

1 in favor of Malika, collectible by any lawful means. Malika further asks the Court
2 to make findings that the sum sought is reasonable under *Brunzell* and *Wilfong*.

3 DATED this 11th day of June, 2021.

4 **GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM**

5 

6 Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
7 Nevada Bar No. 9974
8 725 S. 8th Street, Suite 100
9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
10 Attorney for Defendant

11 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

12 I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 11th day of June 2021, I served a copy
13 of the foregoing MEMORANDUM OF FEES AND COSTS upon each of the
14 parties and addressed to those counsel of record as follows:
15

- 16 ☒ Electronic Service to: DAFS: DAFSLegalGroup@clarkcountyda.com
17 ☐ Via Facsimile to:
18 ☐ Via Email to:
19 ☒ Placing in the U.S. Mail, with postage fully prepaid, addressed to:

20 Steven B. Wolfson, DA
Family Support Division
1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119


Kori Cage
8655 Rowland Bluff Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89178
Respondent

21 
22 An employee of Ghandi Deeter Blackham

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

EXHIBIT 1

Page 12



Malika Coppedge
5961 Tunbridge Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89139

02179-Coppedge

Malika Coppedge : Child Support (#2)

Invoice # 11331
Date: 06/10/2021
Due On: 06/24/2021

Services

Type	Attorney	Date	Description	Quantity	Rate	Discount	Total

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]




[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]






[REDACTED]




[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1.10	\$125.00	-	\$137.50
------	----------	---	----------





Service	TCV	11/30/2020	Download OP's latest Objection and Appeal (10-27-20 recommendations) and save to client file; print copy for file; email copy to client; calendar in-chambers hearing; download scanned letter from DA with NEO of Report and save to client file; download filed Report and Recommendations and save to client file; t/c with DA's child support division re: NEO filed in Coppedge case does not belong to Coppedge; update pleading index and file	1.00	\$125.00	-	\$125.00
---------	-----	------------	---	------	----------	---	----------

Service	TCV	01/15/2021	Download DA's Response to Objection and save to client file; print copy for file; email copy to client	0.10	\$125.00	-	\$12.50
Service	LB	01/20/2021	Discussion with TCV/BB re: OP's objection	0.10	\$300.00	-	\$30.00
Service	LB	01/21/2021	Review OP objection and DA's response; draft response to objection	1.30	\$300.00	-	\$390.00

Service	TCV	01/22/2021	Proofread/e-sign and format Response to OP's Objection; e-file/serve Response; mail response to OP and DA; download filed Response and save to client file; print copy for file; email copy to client	1.00	\$125.00	-	\$125.00
Service	TCV	01/26/2021	T/C from Jason with DA's office returning call from 01/15 (he was out sick) re: incorrect name in their pleading for client	0.10	\$125.00	-	\$12.50
Service	TCV	01/28/2021	Download Notice of Rescheduling of Hearing and save to client file; print copy for file; calendar hearing; email Notice to client; review and respond to email from client re: hearing	0.20	\$125.00	-	\$25.00
Service	TCV	02/17/2021	Scan OP's Reply to Oppositions and save to client file; email copy to client	0.10	\$125.00	-	\$12.50
Service	TCV	02/19/2021	Download Order to Proceed in Forma Pauperis and save to client file; print copy for file; email copy to client	0.10	\$125.00	-	\$12.50
Service	TCV	02/26/2021	Download Order to Proceed in Forma Pauperis and save to client file; print copy for file; download Order Waiving Filing Fee and save to client file; print copy for file; email copy of documents to client	0.20	\$125.00	-	\$25.00
Service	TCV	03/01/2021	Download Notice from Court and save to client file; print copy for file; email copy to client; calendar OP deadlines	0.40	\$125.00	-	\$50.00
Service	TCV	03/06/2021	Review atty corner for documents filed in R case; download filed stamped documents received by mail and save to client file; update pleading index and file	1.10	\$125.00	-	\$137.50

Service	TCV	03/24/2021	Check attorney corner for decision by court	0.10	\$125.00	-	\$12.50
Service	TCV	04/15/2021	LM for Dept. J LC re: status of Order from OP's Objection to 10/2020 Recommendations; msg to attys re: same	0.10	\$125.00	-	\$12.50
Service	TCV	04/20/2021	LM for Dept. J re: status of Order from 03/17 in-chambers hearing	0.10	\$125.00	-	\$12.50
Service	LB	04/21/2021	Review minute order from court; discussion with TCV re: memo of fees	0.10	\$300.00	-	\$30.00
Service	TCV	04/21/2021	Download minute order and save to client file; print copy for file; email copy to client; calendar f/u re: memo of fees	0.20	\$125.00	-	\$25.00
Service	TCV	04/27/2021	Email BB re: running bill for Memo of Fees	0.10	\$125.00	-	\$12.50
Service	LB	04/27/2021	Discussion with BB re: memo of fees	0.60	\$300.00	-	\$180.00
Service	TCV	04/28/2021	Download Order Following Objection and save to client file; print copy for file; email copy to client; update pleading index and file	0.20	\$125.00	-	\$25.00
Service	LB	04/29/2021	Discussion with TCV/BB re: Invoice for memorandum of fees	0.10	\$300.00	-	\$30.00
Line Item Discount Subtotal							-\$127.50
Services Subtotal							\$8,220.00

Expenses

Type	Date	Description	Quantity	Rate	Total
Expense	04/07/2020	Efiling - RSPN	1.00	\$3.50	\$3.50
Expense	06/25/2020	Efiling - NOTC	1.00	\$3.50	\$3.50
Expense	07/31/2020	Efiling - RSPN	1.00	\$3.50	\$3.50
Expense	07/31/2020	July Postage	1.00	\$14.04	\$14.04
Expense	01/22/2021	Efiling: Efiling - RSPN	1.00	\$3.50	\$3.50

Invoice # 11331 - 06/10/2021

Expenses Subtotal	\$28.04
Subtotal	\$8,248.04
Invoice Discount	\$1,500.00
<i>Courtesy Discount</i>	
Total	\$6,748.04

Detailed Statement of Account

Current Invoice

Invoice Number	Due On	Amount Due	Payments Received	Balance Due
11331	06/24/2021	\$6,748.04	\$0.00	\$6,748.04
			Outstanding Balance	\$6,748.04
			Total Amount Outstanding	\$6,748.04

Account	Balance
GDB IOLTA Balance	\$0.00
Total Account Balance	\$0.00

Please make all amounts payable to: Ghandi Deeter Blackham

Please pay within 14 days. 18.0% simple per annum late fee will be charged every 30 days.

FILED

JUN 14 2021

Sharon A. Johnson
CLERK OF COURT

1 **NOA**
2 **KORI CAGE**
3 8655 Rowland Bluff Ave
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89178
5 Phone: (702) 771-2506
6 kcage01@gmail.com

7 Plaintiff in Proper Person

8 **IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE**
9 **STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR**

10 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

11 **KORI CAGE**

12 Appellant,

Case No.: R136990

Dept. No.: J

13 vs.

14 **MALIKA COPPEDGE**

15 Respondent.

06R136990
NOAS
Notice of Appeal
4959793



17 **NOTICE OF APPEAL**

18 Pursuant to NRAP 4, notice is hereby given that Kori Cage, Plaintiff, hereby
19 appeals to the Supreme Court of Nevada the April 28th, 2021, NOTICE OF
20 ENTRY ORDER following objection. The decision of this court was presumably
21 electronically filed on April 28th, 2021, and served via US mail May 11th, 2021,

22 (Exhibit A) by the Honorable Dee Smart Butler in the above captioned action. This

23 Notice of Appeal is in accordance with NRS 238.100 (1) (Date of postmark
24 RECEIVED

25 **RECEIVED**
APPEALS
JUN 14 2021
ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERK

JUL - 7 2021

Page 1 of 2

CLERK OF THE COURT

10

1 deemed date of filing or payment) and filed concurrently with Appellants Motion
2 to Reconsider to the district court under EDCR 2.24.
3

4 DATED this 10 day of June 2021

5 Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of
6 perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

7
8 Kori Cage (signature)
KORI CAGE
8655 Rowland Bluff Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89178
Phone: (702) 771-2506
kcage01@gmail.com
Appellant, Pro se
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Exhibit I

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, District Attorney
Office of the District Attorney
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 E. FLAMINGO ROAD, SUITE 100
LAS VEGAS, NV 89119


ICE REQUESTED

PRST FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
Las Vegas
Las Vegas Precort LLC

N2-48

89178

891



8023210512-200234142

7

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

89178



KORI CAGE
8655 ROWLAND BLUFF AVE.
LAS VEGAS, NV 89178

1 NEOJ
2 STEVEN B. WOLFSON
3 DISTRICT ATTORNEY
4 Nevada Bar No. 0001565
5 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
6 1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
8 (702) 671-9200
9 UPL:437763100A

10
11 IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

12 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

13 NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP)
14 SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),)
15)
16) Petitioner,)
17) CASE NO.: 06R136990
18 vs.) DEPT. No.: J
19) (Child Support Court)
20 KORI L. CAGE,)
21)
22)
23 Respondent.)

24 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

25 TO: KORI L. CAGE, Respondent,

26 TO: NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP SERVICES (MALIKA
27 COPPEDGE), Petitioner:

28 YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on the 28th day
of April, 2021, an ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION was entered in the above-

///

///

1 entitled matter, a copy of which is attached to this Notice.

2 DATED this 11th day of May, 2021.

3
4 Respectfully submitted,
5 Steven B. Wolfson
6 Clark County District Attorney
7 Nevada Bar No. 001565

8 By: Corey Roberts
9 COREY ROBERTS, ESQ.
10 Deputy District Attorney
11 Nevada Bar #012482
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Cert

Case No. 06R136990

2 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

3
4 I hereby certify that service of the above **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER**
5 was made this 11th day of May, 2021, by depositing a copy of same in the United States
6 mail, postage prepaid, addressed to:
7

8 **KORI CAGE**
9 **8655 ROWLAND BLUFF AVE.**
10 **LAS VEGAS, NV 89178**

11
12 By: 

13 Employee, Clark County
14 District Attorney's Office,
15 Family Support Division
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **OFO**
2 STEVEN B. WOLFSON
3 DISTRICT ATTORNEY
4 Nevada Bar No. 001565
5 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
6 1900 East Flamingo Rd., Ste 100
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
8 (702) 671-9200
9 dafslegalgroup@clarkcountynvda.com
10 UPI -- 437763100A

11 **DISTRICT COURT**
12 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

13 NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP)
14 SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),)
15) Case No.: 06R136990
16)
17) Petitioner,)
18 vs.) Dept. No.: J /Child Support
19) Court
20)
21 KORI L. CAGE,)
22)
23)
24) Respondent.)

25 **ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION**

26 This matter having come on for hearing this 17th day of March, 2021, on the
27 Objection of the: ☒ Respondent ☐ Petitioner ☐ District Attorney's Office, Family
Support Division, (hereinafter, "DAFS"), to the Master's Recommendations from
the Child Support Court hearing held on the 27th day of October, 2020;

Respondent being ☐ present ☒ not present

Petitioner being ☐ present ☒ not present

Steven B. Wolfson, District Attorney, being not present by and through
Deputy District Attorney, COREY ROBERTS, Esq.,

ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION
Page 1 of 6

1 NO HEARING HELD due to NRCP 1 and EDCR 1.10 states that the
2 procedure in district courts shall be administered to secure efficient, speedy, and
3 inexpensive determinations in every action. Pursuant to EDCR 2.23(c) and 5.501(b),
4 this Court can consider a motion and issue a decision on the papers at any time
5 without a hearing. Further, pursuant to EDCR 2.20(c), this Court can grant the
6 requested relief if there is no opposition timely filed.
7

8
9 The Court having reviewed the pleadings and papers herein and having heard
10 argument AND GOOD CAUSE THEREFORE APPEARING, this Court hereby
11 enters the following findings, conclusions and orders:
12

13 **COURT FINDS** that per NRS 425.3844(2); a recommendation entered by a
14 master must be furnished to each party at the conclusion of the proceedings or as
15 soon thereafter as possible. Within ten (10) days after receipt of the
16 recommendation, any party may file with the District Court and serve upon the other
17 parties a notice of objection to the recommendation. Pursuant to NRS 425.3844(3) if
18 the objection is not filed within (10) days of receipt of the recommendation, the
19 recommendation entered by the master shall be deemed approved by the District
20 Court, and the clerk of the District Court may file the recommendation and
21 judgement may be entered;
22

23
24 **COURT ALSO FINDS** the Master's Recommendation based on the October
25 27, 2020 hearing was filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020.
26
27

1 No objection had been filed by date. On November 30, 2020, eleven (11) days after
2 the Recommendation was filed by the clerk of the District Court and deemed
3 approved by the District Court, Respondent Cage filed his Objection to the
4 Recommendation. EDCR 1.40(e) addresses Child Support Masters specifically.
5 Accordingly, either party has ten (10) days after the conclusion of the proceeding
6 and receipt of the report to file and serve an objection to recommendations of child
7 support masters. Per NRCP 53(f)(1)(A), a party may file and serve objections to
8 masters report and recommendations (generally) within fourteen (14) days. NRCP
9 6(a)(1)(B) addresses the computation of time for filing motion papers. Parties are to
10 exclude the day of the event that triggers the period, count every day, including
11 intermediate weekends and holidays. Respondent Cage argues that his Objection
12 was filed timely;

13
14 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that the Respondent's argument that the October 27,
15 DSB
16 2020 hearing date must be excluding^{ed} when calculating time is correct;

17
18 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that Respondent's argument that the parties should
19 acknowledge time for receipt of the Recommendation sent to him via mail and time
20 for the clerk of the District Court to receive his Objection mailed to the court is
21 persuasive and correct. However, considering all arguments regarding whether
22 Respondent's Objection was filed timely, the deadline to file an Objection was
23 November 6, 2020 per the ten (10) day rule. Even allowing for the fourteen (14) day
24
25
26
27

1 rule, the deadline would have been November 10, 2020. Furthermore, giving
2 Respondent grace regarding potential delays in receipt of the Recommendation via
3 mail and mailing his Objection, the clerk filed the Recommendation on November
4 19, 2020, thirteen (13) days after the ten (10) day deadline and nine (9) days after the
5 fourteen (14) day deadline. Even giving Respondent Cage three or four days for
6 possible mail delays each way, the Objection was not filed until November 30, 2020.
7 The November 30, 2020 date is twenty-four (24) days beyond the ten (10) day
8 deadline and twenty (20) days beyond the 14 day deadline. Respondent Cage has
9 filed numerous pleadings in this matter since 2019, including pleadings to the
10 Supreme Court of Nevada. Respondent is aware of filing deadlines and must adhere
11 to them;
12

13
14
15 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that Respondent Cage's Objection was filed untimely
16 and will not be considered. Furthermore, per NRCP 53(e)(2) and EDCR 1.40(d), the
17 District Court SHALL accept the Master's Recommendations unless clearly
18 erroneous. The clearly erroneous standard of review generally means that the
19 reviewing court must have a definite and firm conviction that a mistake was
20 committed. No such finding can be made here. Lastly, Petitioner Coppedge alleges
21 that Respondent Cage has increased litigation costs which caused a financial burden
22 and forced her to incur unnecessary attorney's fees and costs. Respondent as filed at
23 least three objections.
24
25
26
27

1 **ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND**
2 **DECREED** that two prior objections were denied and now this objection filed
3 untimely is **DENIED**.
4

5 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that **THIS**
6 **COURT ORDERS** that Petitioner's request for attorney's fees and costs is
7 **GRANTED**. Counsel for Petitioner shall file a Memorandum of Fees and Costs,
8 submit an unredacted billing statement to Chambers, and submit a corresponding
9 Order for Attorney s Fees and Costs;
10

11 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
12 the Master's Recommendation from the October 27, 2020 hearing (**EXHIBIT 1**),
13

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


26

27

1 filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020, SHALL be affirmed
2 and adopted. DAFS shall submit the Order with the appropriate findings.


3 ~~DATED~~ this _____ day of _____, 2021.

4
5 Dated this 28th day of April, 2021

6 

7 DEE SMART BUTLER,
8 HONORABLE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
9 **3CA D82 1F4C 727F**
Dee Smart Butler
District Court Judge

Submitted By:

10
11 

12 COREY ROBERTS, ESQ.
13 DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
14 Nevada Bar No. 12482
15 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
16 1900 East Flamingo Rd., Ste 100
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
18 (702) 671-9200
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1 MRAO
2 STEVEN B. WOLFSON
3 DISTRICT ATTORNEY
4 Nevada Bar No. 001565
5 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
6 1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
8 (702) 671-9200
9 TTY and/or other relay services: 711
437763100A

District Court
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

10 NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP SERVICES,)
11 (MALIKA COPPEDGE),)
12)
13)
14)
15)
16)
17)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)
29)
30)
31)
32)
33)
34)
35)
36)
37)
38)
39)
40)
41)
42)
43)
44)
45)
46)
47)
48)
49)
50)
51)
52)
53)
54)
55)
56)
57)
58)
59)
60)
61)
62)
63)
64)
65)
66)
67)
68)
69)
70)
71)
72)
73)
74)
75)
76)
77)
78)
79)
80)
81)
82)
83)
84)
85)
86)
87)
88)
89)
90)
91)
92)
93)
94)
95)
96)
97)
98)
99)
100)
101)
102)
103)
104)
105)
106)
107)
108)
109)
110)
111)
112)
113)
114)
115)
116)
117)
118)
119)
120)
121)
122)
123)
124)
125)
126)
127)
128)
129)
130)
131)
132)
133)
134)
135)
136)
137)
138)
139)
140)
141)
142)
143)
144)
145)
146)
147)
148)
149)
150)
151)
152)
153)
154)
155)
156)
157)
158)
159)
160)
161)
162)
163)
164)
165)
166)
167)
168)
169)
170)
171)
172)
173)
174)
175)
176)
177)
178)
179)
180)
181)
182)
183)
184)
185)
186)
187)
188)
189)
190)
191)
192)
193)
194)
195)
196)
197)
198)
199)
200)
201)
202)
203)
204)
205)
206)
207)
208)
209)
210)
211)
212)
213)
214)
215)
216)
217)
218)
219)
220)
221)
222)
223)
224)
225)
226)
227)
228)
229)
230)
231)
232)
233)
234)
235)
236)
237)
238)
239)
240)
241)
242)
243)
244)
245)
246)
247)
248)
249)
250)
251)
252)
253)
254)
255)
256)
257)
258)
259)
260)
261)
262)
263)
264)
265)
266)
267)
268)
269)
270)
271)
272)
273)
274)
275)
276)
277)
278)
279)
280)
281)
282)
283)
284)
285)
286)
287)
288)
289)
290)
291)
292)
293)
294)
295)
296)
297)
298)
299)
300)
301)
302)
303)
304)
305)
306)
307)
308)
309)
310)
311)
312)
313)
314)
315)
316)
317)
318)
319)
320)
321)
322)
323)
324)
325)
326)
327)
328)
329)
330)
331)
332)
333)
334)
335)
336)
337)
338)
339)
340)
341)
342)
343)
344)
345)
346)
347)
348)
349)
350)
351)
352)
353)
354)
355)
356)
357)
358)
359)
360)
361)
362)
363)
364)
365)
366)
367)
368)
369)
370)
371)
372)
373)
374)
375)
376)
377)
378)
379)
380)
381)
382)
383)
384)
385)
386)
387)
388)
389)
390)
391)
392)
393)
394)
395)
396)
397)
398)
399)
400)
401)
402)
403)
404)
405)
406)
407)
408)
409)
410)
411)
412)
413)
414)
415)
416)
417)
418)
419)
420)
421)
422)
423)
424)
425)
426)
427)
428)
429)
430)
431)
432)
433)
434)
435)
436)
437)
438)
439)
440)
441)
442)
443)
444)
445)
446)
447)
448)
449)
450)
451)
452)
453)
454)
455)
456)
457)
458)
459)
460)
461)
462)
463)
464)
465)
466)
467)
468)
469)
470)
471)
472)
473)
474)
475)
476)
477)
478)
479)
480)
481)
482)
483)
484)
485)
486)
487)
488)
489)
490)
491)
492)
493)
494)
495)
496)
497)
498)
499)
500)
501)
502)
503)
504)
505)
506)
507)
508)
509)
510)
511)
512)
513)
514)
515)
516)
517)
518)
519)
520)
521)
522)
523)
524)
525)
526)
527)
528)
529)
530)
531)
532)
533)
534)
535)
536)
537)
538)
539)
540)
541)
542)
543)
544)
545)
546)
547)
548)
549)
550)
551)
552)
553)
554)
555)
556)
557)
558)
559)
560)
561)
562)
563)
564)
565)
566)
567)
568)
569)
570)
571)
572)
573)
574)
575)
576)
577)
578)
579)
580)
581)
582)
583)
584)
585)
586)
587)
588)
589)
590)
591)
592)
593)
594)
595)
596)
597)
598)
599)
600)
601)
602)
603)
604)
605)
606)
607)
608)
609)
610)
611)
612)
613)
614)
615)
616)
617)
618)
619)
620)
621)
622)
623)
624)
625)
626)
627)
628)
629)
630)
631)
632)
633)
634)
635)
636)
637)
638)
639)
640)
641)
642)
643)
644)
645)
646)
647)
648)
649)
650)
651)
652)
653)
654)
655)
656)
657)
658)
659)
660)
661)
662)
663)
664)
665)
666)
667)
668)
669)
670)
671)
672)
673)
674)
675)
676)
677)
678)
679)
680)
681)
682)
683)
684)
685)
686)
687)
688)
689)
690)
691)
692)
693)
694)
695)
696)
697)
698)
699)
700)
701)
702)
703)
704)
705)
706)
707)
708)
709)
710)
711)
712)
713)
714)
715)
716)
717)
718)
719)
720)
721)
722)
723)
724)
725)
726)
727)
728)
729)
730)
731)
732)
733)
734)
735)
736)
737)
738)
739)
740)
741)
742)
743)
744)
745)
746)
747)
748)
749)
750)
751)
752)
753)
754)
755)
756)
757)
758)
759)
760)
761)
762)
763)
764)
765)
766)
767)
768)
769)
770)
771)
772)
773)
774)
775)
776)
777)
778)
779)
780)
781)
782)
783)
784)
785)
786)
787)
788)
789)
790)
791)
792)
793)
794)
795)
796)
797)
798)
799)
800)
801)
802)
803)
804)
805)
806)
807)
808)
809)
810)
811)
812)
813)
814)
815)
816)
817)
818)
819)
820)
821)
822)
823)
824)
825)
826)
827)
828)
829)
830)
831)
832)
833)
834)
835)
836)
837)
838)
839)
840)
841)
842)
843)
844)
845)
846)
847)
848)
849)
850)
851)
852)
853)
854)
855)
856)
857)
858)
859)
860)
861)
862)
863)
864)
865)
866)
867)
868)
869)
870)
871)
872)
873)
874)
875)
876)
877)
878)
879)
880)
881)
882)
883)
884)
885)
886)
887)
888)
889)
890)
891)
892)
893)
894)
895)
896)
897)
898)
899)
900)
901)
902)
903)
904)
905)
906)
907)
908)
909)
910)
911)
912)
913)
914)
915)
916)
917)
918)
919)
920)
921)
922)
923)
924)
925)
926)
927)
928)
929)
930)
931)
932)
933)
934)
935)
936)
937)
938)
939)
940)
941)
942)
943)
944)
945)
946)
947)
948)
949)
950)
951)
952)
953)
954)
955)
956)
957)
958)
959)
960)
961)
962)
963)
964)
965)
966)
967)
968)
969)
970)
971)
972)
973)
974)
975)
976)
977)
978)
979)
980)
981)
982)
983)
984)
985)
986)
987)
988)
989)
990)
991)
992)
993)
994)
995)
996)
997)
998)
999)
1000)

Case No. 06R136990

Department No. CHILD SUPPORT

MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION

This matter having been heard on **OCTOBER 27, 2020** before the undersigned Hearing Master, having considered all the evidence and having been fully advised in the premises, hereby makes the following Findings and Recommendations:

Parties present: ☒ Respondent ☐ Respondent's attorney ☒ Petitioner ☒ Petitioner's attorney

☐ PATERNITY ☒ PATERNITY PREVIOUSLY DECIDED

☒ FINANCIALS: ☐ CONTINUE PRIOR ORDERS (NO CHANGE TO PRIOR FINANCIAL ORDERS).

Basis for adjustment from state formula: _____

Respondent is to pay current support for the child(ren), **Kyree Cage, Jayla Nicole Cage.**

CHILD SUPPORT

Respondent is to pay monthly:

\$268.00 child support
_____ medical support
_____ spousal support
_____ arrears payment

☐ ARREARAGES ☒ ARREARAGES NOT ADDRESSED AT THIS HEARING

\$ 268.00

TOTAL monthly payment is due on the 1st day of each month, and continues thereafter until said child(ren) reach majority, become emancipated or further order of the Court.

Respondent's **INCOME SHALL BE WITHHELD** for the payment of support.

☐ Good cause to stay income withholding is based on: _____. Said withholding shall be postponed until Respondent becomes delinquent in an amount equal to 30 days support.

☐ ENFORCEMENT OF CONTROLLING ORDER: The registered order from _____, dated _____, # _____, is hereby confirmed and is the controlling order for the following reasons: ☐ only order _____.

☐ ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTROLLING ORDER: This is the first order establishing a child support obligation for this noncustodial parent for the child(ren) listed in this order who reside(s) with this custodian.

☒ Health insurance coverage for the minor child(ren) herein:

☒ Respondent to provide: ☐ Petitioner to provide: ☐ Both Parties to provide:

☒ if available through employer. ☐ shall provide per court order.

☒ Ordered Party(ies) to provide proof of said insurance to the District Attorney's Office, Family Support Division within 90 days of today's date.

Under the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid is acceptable coverage.

EXHIBIT 1

FINDING 1.6

☐ CONTEMPT OF COURT ☒ NOT A SHOW CAUSE HEARING

☒ MODIFICATION OF PRIOR ORDER:

☒ Modification effective: 10/1/2020.

☒ This order modifies a previously existing, previously controlling support order. By this modification, this tribunal assumes or retains continuing, exclusive jurisdiction of the child support obligation for the child(ren) and parties identified in this order. Modification is proper for the following reason(s):

☒ The previously controlling order is from Clark County, Nevada, dated April 23, 2018, #D-07-374223-P.

☒ An individual party, Kori Cage, has requested modification of the previously controlling Nevada support order.

☐ An individual party, _____, has requested modification; this tribunal has personal jurisdiction over the non-movant and the issuing state (the state whose order controlled prior to this modification) is no longer the residence of any individual party/contestant or child(ren).

☐ An individual party, _____, has requested modification; all individual parties and children now reside in Nevada.

☐ All parties have filed written consent with the tribunal whose order controlled prior to this modification for this tribunal to modify the support obligation and assume continuing, exclusive jurisdiction.

☐ SUSPENSION OF LICENSES:

PAYMENTS

All mailed payments MUST be made in the form of a cashier's check, money order or business check ONLY, made payable to State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU).

Payments can be mailed to:

State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU)

P.O. Box 98950

Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8950

Additionally, the following information must be included with each payment: name (first, middle, last) of person responsible for paying child support, social security number of person responsible for paying child support, child support case number, and name of petitioner (first and last name of person receiving child support).

NOTICE: NO CREDIT WILL BE GIVEN FOR PAYMENTS PAID DIRECTLY TO THE PETITIONER.

Please visit www.clarkcountynv.gov/district-attorney/fs for alternative payment options.

NOTICE: PRIOR ORDERS NOT SPECIFICALLY MODIFIED HEREIN REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT

NOTICE: Interest will be assessed on all unpaid child support balances for cases with a Nevada controlling order pursuant to NRS 99.040. If the Respondent pays support through income withholding and the full obligation is not met by the amount withheld by the employer, the Respondent is responsible to pay the difference between the court ordered obligation and the amount withheld by the employer directly to the state disbursement unit. If the Respondent fails to do so, he/she may be subject to assessment of interest. The Respondent may avoid these additional costs by making current support payments each month. If another state takes jurisdiction and obtains a new order, Nevada interest will only be calculated to the date of the new order and will be enforced.

NOTICE: Pursuant to NRS 125B.145 and federal law, EITHER parent, the legal guardian, and the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, where there is an assignment of support rights to the State, has the right to request a review of the support provision of this order at least every three (3) years to determine if modification is appropriate; an application for this purpose may be obtained from D.A. Family Support at 1900 E. Flamingo Rd., Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168.

NOTICE: Objections/Appeals are governed by EDCR1.40(e) and (f). You have ten (10) days from receipt of this Master's Recommendation to serve and file written objections to it. A failure to file and serve written objections will result in a final Order/Judgment being ordered by District Court.

NOTICE: Appeal from a Final Judgment by the Court is governed by NRAP 4 and must be filed within 30 days of written Notice of Entry of Judgment.

NOTICE: Respondent is responsible for notifying the District Attorney, Family Support Division, of any change of address, change of employment, health insurance coverage, change of custody, or any order relative to child support within ten (10) days of such change.

NOTICE: If you want to adjust the amount of child support established in this order, you **MUST** file a motion to modify the order with or submit a stipulation to the court. If a motion to modify the order is not filed or a stipulation is not submitted, the child support obligation established in this order will continue until such time as all children who are the subject of this order reach 18 years of age or, if the youngest child who is subject to this order is still in high school when he or she reaches 18 years of age, when the child graduates from high school or reaches 19 years of age, whichever comes first. Unless the parties agree otherwise in a stipulation, any modification made pursuant to a motion to modify the order will be effective as of the date the motion was filed.

Respondent to bring new financial statement and proof of income next date.

This order does not stay collection of support arrearages by execution or any other means allowed by law.

MISCELLANEOUS FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Last payment- October 19, 2020 via UIB.

Parties have parallel Family District Court case, D-07-374223-P, wherein Petitioner was awarded Primary Physical Custody. See Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Judgment filed April 23, 2018. Nevada Supreme Court affirmed in part and reversed in part the order. See NV Supreme Court Clerk's Certificate/Judgment- Affd/Rev Part filed February 6, 2020.

Procedural History: Respondent requested modification based on a change of circumstance (20% change in income) pursuant to NRS 125B.145(4)/NAC 425.170(1). (1) December 13, 2019 set temporary order of \$323 per month based on GMI \$1,811 (25% of GMI = \$453) and downward deviation of \$65 per child per month for 2 additional children. Respondent is legally responsible for but continued the matter based on jurisdictional question as the Nevada Supreme Court had not issued a remittitur; temporary support order only to deal with contempt issue only. (2) March 13, 2020 hearing granted Respondent's request to reduce obligation, but left the obligation as temporary pending a hearing September 25, 2020 to determine Respondent's GMI as UIB may end September 2020. (3) July 6, 2020 and September 22, 2020 hearing dates were continued.

Respondent's prior Gross Monthly Income was \$3,262.44. A 20% change in income = \$652.49.

Respondent's current income via UIB to be \$418 per week x 52 weeks = annual income of \$21,736 / 12 months = Gross Monthly Income of \$1,811.33.


NAC 425 obligation for 2 children = \$398.49 (GMI: \$1,811.33 x 22%).

Respondent is legally responsible for 2 additional children, Kamryn Cage (03/26/2013); London Cage (02/09/2014), not of the relationship. \$130 deviation (\$65/month per child) discussed/considered at December 13, 2019 hearing. District Court's April 23, 2018 Judgment did not grant a deviation for other minor children.

Respondent receives Medicaid and Food stamps. Minor children have Medicaid under Respondent's public assistance program.

Childcare costs: none at this time.

NEXT HEARING DATE IS O/C in Courtroom in Child Support Court at Child Support Center of Southern Nevada, 1900 East Flamingo Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, for further proceedings.

DATED: OCTOBER 27, 2020

 MASTER

USJR DISPOSITIONS

- ☒ - Settled/Withdrawn w/Judicial Conference/Hearing
☐ - Involuntary (Statutory) Dismissal
☐ - Dismissed / Want of Prosecution
☐ - Transferred to Another Jurisdiction
☐ - Other Manner of Dispo
☐ - Close Case

Respondent/Respondent's Attorney
 Receipt of this document is
 acknowledged by my signature.

ORDER/JUDGMENT


☐ The Clerk of the Court having reviewed the District Court's file and having determined that no objection has been filed within the ten day objection period, the Master's Recommendation is hereby deemed approved by the District Court pursuant to NRS 425.3844. The affixing of the Clerk of the Court's file stamp to this Master's Recommendation signifies that the ten-day objection period has expired without an objection having been filed and that the District Court deems the Master's Recommendation to be approved as an ORDER/JUDGMENT of the District Court, effective with the file stamp date, without need of a District Court Judge's signature affixed hereto. The parties are ordered to comply with this Order/Judgment.

☒ The District Court, having reviewed the above and foregoing Master's Recommendation, and having received and considered the objection thereto, as well as any other papers, testimony and argument related thereto and good cause appearing,

☒ IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Master's Recommendation IS affirmed and adopted as an ORDER/JUDGMENT of the District Court this 28th day of April, 20 21.

☐ IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Master's Recommendation IS NOT affirmed and adopted this _____ day of _____, 20____ and this matter is remanded to Child Support Court on _____, 20____ at _____ M.


Dated this 28th day of April, 2021



District Court Judge, Family Division

6AB 233 6D14 7113
 Dee Smart Butler
 District Court Judge

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark County District Attorney
 Nevada Bar No. 001565

By: 
 DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
 1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168

Cable
81055 Rowland Bluff Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89178


Supreme Court of Nevada
Clerk of the Court
201 South Carson Street, Suite 201
Carson City, NV 89701

CPU



U.S. POSTAGE
\$2.60
FCM# 0020
Orig: 89139 MS
Dest: 89701 MS
06/10/21
2000061787 02

R2305K137023



FILED

JUN 14 2021

Sharon A. Johnson
CLERK OF COURT

CAS
KORI CAGE
8655 Rowland Bluff Ave
Las Vegas, Nevada 89178
Phone: (702) 771-2506
kcage01@gmail.com
Respondent in Proper Person

IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE
STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

KORI CAGE,

Appellant,

vs.

NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP
SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),

Respondent.

Case No. R136990
Dept No. J


06R136990
ASTA
Case Appeal Statement
4959794



CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

Pursuant to NRAP 3(f), Appellant, KORI CAGE, an individual, hereby provides the following *Case Appeal Statement*:

1. **Name of appellant filing this case appeal statement (NRAP 3(f)(3)(C)):**
KORI CAGE, an individual.
2. **Identify the judge issuing the decision, judgment, or order appealed from (NRAP 3(f)(3)(B)):**
Honorable Dee Smart Butler, Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Las Vegas.



1. **3. Identify all parties to the proceedings in the district court (the use of et al. to denote parties is prohibited) (NRAP 3(f)(3)(A)):**
2 (a) KORI CAGE, an individual;
3 (b) MALIKA COPPEDGE, an individual;
4 (c) DA, Steven B. Wolfson, Family Support Division
5. **4. Identify all parties involved in this appeal (the use of et al. to denote parties is prohibited) (NRAP 3(f)(3)((C),(D)):**
6 (a) KORI CAGE, an individual; Pro Se
7 (b) MALIKA COPPEDGE, an individual;
8 (c) DA, Steven B. Wolfson, Family Support Division
9. **5. Set forth the name, law firm, address, and telephone number of all counsel on appeal and identify the party or parties whom they represent (NRAP 3(f)(3)(C), (D)):**
10 (a) Pro Se
11 *Counsel for Appellant, KORI CAGE*
- 12 (b) Brian E. Blackham
13 Nevada Bar No. 9974
14 GHAMDI DEETER BLACKHAM
15 725 South 8th Street, Suite 89101
16 Las Vegas, NV 89101
17 Telephone: (702) 878-1115
18 *Counsel for Respondent, MALIKA COPPEDGE*
- 19 (c) Leah Blakesley
20 Nevada Bar No. 12802
21 GHAMDI DEETER BLACKHAM
22 725 South 8th Street, Suite 89101
23 Las Vegas, NV 89101
24 Telephone: (702) 878-1115
25 *Counsel for Respondent, MALIKA COPPEDGE*
- (d) Steven B. Wolfson
Nevada Bar No. 0001565
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119
Telephone: (702) 671-9200
It appears to be: Counsel for Respondent, MALIKA COPPEDGE

1
2 **6. Indicate whether appellant was represented by appointed or retained**
3 **counsel in the district court (NRAP 3(f)(3)(F)):**

Appellant was NOT represented by retained counsel in district court.

4 **7. Indicate whether appellant is represented by appointed or retained**
5 **counsel on appeal (NRAP 3(f)(3)(F)):**

Appellant is NOT represented by retained counsel on appeal.

6 **8. Indicate whether appellant was granted leave to proceed in forma**
7 **pauperis, and the date of entry of the district court order granting such**
8 **leave (NRAP 3(f)(3)(G)):**

Appellant was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed February 25,
2021, in the SC # 82333 docket # 21-05627

9
10 **9. Indicate the date of the proceedings commenced in the district court**
11 **(e.g., date complaint, indictment, information, or petition was filed)**
12 **(NRAP 3(f)(3)(H)):**

*Petition was filed in the district court under NRS 238.100 (1) November 9th,
2020, Proceeding took place March 17, 2021*

13 **10. District court case number and caption showing the names of all parties**
14 **to the proceedings below, but the use of et al. to denote parties is**
15 **prohibited (NRAP 3(f)(3)(A)):**

(a) Case number:

16 Eighth Judicial District Court, Case number: 6R136990
17 Department: J

18 (b) Caption:

19 NV DHHS Division of Welfare & Supp Services
20 (MALIKA COPPEDGE), an individual,
21 Petitioner,

22 vs.

23 KORI LOVETT CAGE, an individual,
24 Respondent.
25

1 **11. Whether any of respondents' attorneys are not licensed to practice law**
2 **in Nevada, and, if so, whether the district court granted that attorney**
3 **permission to appear under SCR 42, including a copy of any district**
4 **court order granting that permission (NRAP 3(t)(3)(E)):**

Based upon information and belief, all attorneys for the Respondent are licensed to practice law in Nevada.

5 **12. Brief description of the nature of the action and result in district court,**
6 **including the type of judgment or order being appealed and the relief**
7 **granted by the district court (NRAP 3(f)(3)(1)):**

8 These underlying proceedings are a suit concerning child Support
9 modification. Early September 2019, Appellant was terminated from his
10 place of employment, through no fault of his own, consequently the
11 Appellant started collecting unemployment benefits. On September 12th,
12 2019, Appellant Petitioned the DA's office to modify his child support
13 obligation, motion filed in the UIFSA court November 4th, 2019.

14 On December 13, 2019, the UIFSA hearing master issued a temporary
15 modification of Appellants child support obligation and ordered both parties
16 to return with their 2018 and 2019 tax returns to consider relative income.
17 Recommendations were temporary due to jurisdictional concerns pending
18 the remittitur in the Supreme Court case # SCN76006, district court case #
19 D07374223. A returning hearing was set for March 13, 2020.

- 20 • The remittitur was received by the district court February 6, 2020.
- 21 • Despite the plain language of NRS 125B.145 and the remittitur being
22 received by the district court; hearing after hearing ensued regarding
23 this matter and continues to this day.
- 24 • March 13, 2020, hearing was continued to July 6, 2020
- 25 • July 6, 2020, hearing was continued to September 25, 2020.
- September 25, 2020, hearing was moved forward to September 22,
2020.
- September 22, 2020, hearing was continued to October 27, 2020.
- Now the October 27, 2020, hearing is continued to June 28, 2021.

After objecting to the UIFSA court's recommendations after each
compounding hearing under EDCR 1.40(e) and (f), the district court issued
its Notice of Order on April 28, 2021, Ordering [1] attorney's fees to the
Respondent and [2] not considering Appellant's argument for allegedly
filing his objection untimely.

1 13. Whether the case has previously been the subject of an appeal to or
2 original writ proceeding in the Supreme Court and, if so, the caption
3 and Supreme Court docket number of the prior proceeding (NRAP
4 3(f)(J)):
Cage VS. Coppedge
SC Case # 82333

5 14. Whether the appeal involves child custody or visitation (NRAP
6 3(f)(3)(K)):
The appeal does NOT involve child custody or visitation.

7 15. In civil cases, whether the appeal involves the possibility of settlement
8 (NRAP 3(f)(3)(L)):
9 The appeal does not involve the possibility of settlement.

10 DATED this 10 day of June 2021

11
12 Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under
13 penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true
14 and correct.

15 Kori Cage (signature)
16 KORI CAGE
17 Appellant, Pro se
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 10 day of June 2021, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL and CASE APPEAL STATEMENT in the United States Mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

Clerk of the Court
201 South Carson Street, Suite 201
Carson City NV 89701


Clerk's Office Filing Department
601 North Pecos Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89155


Steven B. Wolfson, DA
Family Support Division
1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119


Brian E. Blackham / Leah Blakesley
725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

DATED this 10 day of June 2021

Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

 (signature)
KORI CAGE
Respondent, Pro se




CLERK OF THE COURT

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
FAMILY DIVISION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

MALIKA COPPEDGE,

Applicant,

vs.

KORI L. CAGE,

Adverse Party.

CASE NO.: 06R136990

DEPARTMENT J

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This Court entered a Report and Recommendation concerning Respondent's child support obligation on October 17, 2020. Respondent Objected to the Report and Recommendation. Judge Butler denied the Objection and Affirmed the Report and Recommendation on April 28, 2021. Respondent also filed an Appeal of the Decision to the Nevada Supreme Court. The Supreme Court dismissed the Appeal on May 4, 2021.

Respondent has now filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the support decision affirmed by the District Court. Pursuant to EDCR 2.24, this motion needed to be filed within 14 days of this Court's prior decision. .

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that the Motion for Reconsideration be DENIED as it is untimely.

///

///

///

///

1 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED, that the hearing on June 29, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. be
2 VACATED.

3
4 Dated this 16th day of June, 2021.

5
6 
7 JON NORHEIM
8 Child Support Hearing Master

9
10 NOTICE

11
12 Pursuant to EDCR 1.40 (e) and (f), you are hereby notified you have 10 days from the date
13 from receipt of this document within which to file written objections thereto. You have 13 days
14 from the date this document is placed in counsel's folder or is mailed if those methods of service
15 are utilized.


16
17 CLERK'S CERTIFICATE SERVICE

18
19 I hereby certify on this 16th day of June, 2021, a copy of the Hearing Master's Decision was:

20 ☒ BY MAIL: a copy via first-class, postage fully prepaid - Ghandi Deeter Blackham
21 to: Atty for the Petitioner - 725 S. 8th St #100, Las Vegas NV
22 89101
23 ☒ BY MAIL a copy via first-class, postage fully prepaid -
to: Kori Cage - Respondent - 8655 Rowland Bluff Ave Las Vegas, NV
24 89178
25 BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: Chief Deputy District Attorney _____
26 DAFSLegalGroup@Clarkcountynvda.com

27
28 By: Katherine Kemp
Legal Secretary for Child Support

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING



I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 10 day of June 2021, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL and CASE APPEAL STATEMENT in the United States Mail, with first-class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

Clerk of the Court
201 South Carson Street, Suite 201
Carson City NV 89701

Clerk's Office Filing Department
601 North Pecos Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Steven B. Wolfson, DA
Family Support Division
1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Brian E. Blackham / Leah Blakesley
725 South 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

DATED this 10 day of June 2021

Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

 (signature)
KORI CAGE
Respondent, Pro se



1 **NOA**
2 **KORI CAGE**
3 8655 Rowland Bluff Ave
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89178
5 Phone: (702) 771-2506
6 kcage01@gmail.com

7 Plaintiff in Proper Person

8 **IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE**
9 **STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR**

10 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

11 **KORI CAGE**

12 Appellant,

13 vs.

14 **MALIKA COPPEDGE**

15 Respondent.
16

Case No.: R136990

Dept. No.: J

17 **NOTICE OF APPEAL**

18 Pursuant to NRAP 4, notice is hereby given that Kori Cage, Plaintiff, hereby
19 appeals to the Supreme Court of Nevada the April 28th, 2021, NOTICE OF
20 ENTRY ORDER following objection. The decision of this court was presumably
21 electronically filed on April 28th, 2021, and served via US mail May 11th, 2021,
22 (Exhibit 1) by the Honorable Dee Smart Butler in the above captioned action. This
23 Notice of Appeal is in accordance with NRS 238.100 (1) (Date of postmark
24
25

1 deemed date of filing or payment) and filed concurrently with Appellants Motion
2 to Reconsider to the district court under EDCR 2.24.
3

4 DATED this 10 day of June 2021

5 Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under penalty of
6 perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

7
8  (signature)
KORI CAGE
8655 Rowland Bluff Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89178
Phone: (702) 771-2506
kcage01@gmail.com
Appellant, Pro se

Exhibit I

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, *District Attorney*
Office of the District Attorney
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 E. FLAMINGO ROAD, SUITE 100
LAS VEGAS, NV 89119

CE REQUESTED

890 891 89178 **N2-48**

6023210512-200234142

PRST FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
Las Vegas
Las Vegas Priority LLC

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

89178

KORI CAGE
8655 ROWLAND BLUFF AVE.
LAS VEGAS, NV 89178

1 **NEOJ**
2 **STEVEN B. WOLFSON**
3 **DISTRICT ATTORNEY**
4 **Nevada Bar No. 0001565**
5 **FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION**
6 **1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100**
7 **Las Vegas, Nevada 89119**
8 **(702) 671-9200**
9 **UPI:437763100A**

10 **IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

11 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

12 NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP)
13 SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),)
14)
15 Petitioner,)
16) CASE NO.: 06R136990
17 vs.) DEPT. No.: J
18) (Child Support Court)
19 KORI L. CAGE,)
20)
21 Respondent.)

22 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER**

23 TO: KORI L. CAGE, Respondent,

24 TO: NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & * SUPP SERVICES (MALIKA
25 COPPEDGE), Petitioner:

26 YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on the 28th day
27 of April, 2021, an ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION was entered in the above-
28

///

///

1 entitled matter, a copy of which is attached to this Notice.

2 DATED this 11th day of May, 2021.

3
4 Respectfully submitted,
5 Steven B. Wolfson
6 Clark County District Attorney
7 Nevada Bar No. 001565

8 By: Corey Roberts
9 COREY ROBERTS, ESQ.
10 Deputy District Attorney
11 Nevada Bar #012482
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


1 Cert

Case No. 06R136990

2 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

3
4 I hereby certify that service of the above **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER**
5 was made this 11th day of May, 2021, by depositing a copy of same in the United States
6 mail, postage prepaid, addressed to:
7

8 **KORI CAGE**
9 **8655 ROWLAND BLUFF AVE.**
10 **LAS VEGAS, NV 89178**

11
12 By: 
13 Employee, Clark County
14 District Attorney's Office,
15 Family Support Division
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

OFO
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Nevada Bar No. 001565
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 East Flamingo Rd., Ste 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
(702) 671-9200
dafslegalgroup@clarkcountynvda.com
UPI - 437763100A

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP	)	
SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),	)	
	)	Case No.: 06R136990
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	Dept. No.: J /Child Support
	)	Court
KORI L. CAGE,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION

This matter having come on for hearing this 17th day of March, 2021, on the
Objection of the: ☒ Respondent ☐ Petitioner ☐ District Attorney's Office, Family
Support Division, (hereinafter, "DAFS"), to the Master's Recommendations from
the Child Support Court hearing held on the 27th day of October, 2020;

Respondent being ☐ present ☒ not present

Petitioner being ☐ present ☒ not present

Steven B. Wolfson, District Attorney, being not present by and through
Deputy District Attorney, COREY ROBERTS, Esq.,

ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION
Page 1 of 6

1 NO HEARING HELD due to NRCP 1 and EDCR 1.10 states that the
2 procedure in district courts shall be administered to secure efficient, speedy, and
3 inexpensive determinations in every action. Pursuant to EDCR 2.23(c) and 5.501(b),
4 this Court can consider a motion and issue a decision on the papers at any time
5 without a hearing. Further, pursuant to EDCR 2.20(c), this Court can grant the
6 requested relief if there is no opposition timely filed.
7

8
9 The Court having reviewed the pleadings and papers herein and having heard
10 argument AND GOOD CAUSE THEREFORE APPEARING, this Court hereby
11 enters the following findings, conclusions and orders:
12

13 **COURT FINDS** that per NRS 425.3844(2); a recommendation entered by a
14 master must be furnished to each party at the conclusion of the proceedings or as
15 soon thereafter as possible. Within ten (10) days after receipt of the
16 recommendation, any party may file with the District Court and serve upon the other
17 parties a notice of objection to the recommendation. Pursuant to NRS 425.3844(3) if
18 the objection is not filed within (10) days of receipt of the recommendation, the
19 recommendation entered by the master shall be deemed approved by the District
20 Court, and the clerk of the District Court may file the recommendation and
21 judgement may be entered;
22

23
24 **COURT ALSO FINDS** the Master's Recommendation based on the October
25 27, 2020 hearing was filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020.
26
27

1 No objection had been filed by date. On November 30, 2020, eleven (11) days after
2 the Recommendation was filed by the clerk of the District Court and deemed
3 approved by the District Court, Respondent Cage filed his Objection to the
4 Recommendation. EDCR 1.40(e) addresses Child Support Masters specifically.
5 Accordingly, either party has ten (10) days after the conclusion of the proceeding
6 and receipt of the report to file and serve an objection to recommendations of child
7 support masters. Per NRCP 53(f)(1)(A), a party may file and serve objections to
8 masters report and recommendations (generally) within fourteen (14) days. NRCP
9 6(a)(1)(B) addresses the computation of time for filing motion papers. Parties are to
10 exclude the day of the event that triggers the period, count every day, including
11 intermediate weekends and holidays. Respondent Cage argues that his Objection
12 was filed timely;

13
14
15
16
17 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that the Respondent's argument that the October 27,
18 2020 hearing date must be excluding^{ed} ~~ing~~ DSB when calculating time is correct;

19
20 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that Respondent's argument that the parties should
21 acknowledge time for receipt of the Recommendation sent to him via mail and time
22 for the clerk of the District Court to receive his Objection mailed to the court is
23 persuasive and correct. However, considering all arguments regarding whether
24 Respondent's Objection was filed timely, the deadline to file an Objection was
25 November 6, 2020 per the ten (10) day rule. Even allowing for the fourteen (14) day
26

27
ORDER FOLLOWING OBJECTION
Page 3 of 6

1 rule, the deadline would have been November 10, 2020. Furthermore, giving
2 Respondent grace regarding potential delays in receipt of the Recommendation via
3 mail and mailing his Objection, the clerk filed the Recommendation on November
4 19, 2020, thirteen (13) days after the ten (10) day deadline and nine (9) days after the
5 fourteen (14) day deadline. Even giving Respondent Cage three or four days for
6 possible mail delays each way, the Objection was not filed until November 30, 2020.
7
8 The November 30, 2020 date is twenty-four (24) days beyond the ten (10) day
9 deadline and twenty (20) days beyond the 14 day deadline. Respondent Cage has
10 filed numerous pleadings in this matter since 2019, including pleadings to the
11 Supreme Court of Nevada. Respondent is aware of filing deadlines and must adhere
12 to them;
13

14
15 **COURT ALSO FINDS** that Respondent Cage's Objection was filed untimely
16 and will not be considered. Furthermore, per NRCP 53(e)(2) and EDCR 1.40(d), the
17 District Court SHALL accept the Master's Recommendations unless clearly
18 erroneous. The clearly erroneous standard of review generally means that the
19 reviewing court must have a definite and firm conviction that a mistake was
20 committed. No such finding can be made here. Lastly, Petitioner Coppedge alleges
21 that Respondent Cage has increased litigation costs which caused a financial burden
22 and forced her to incur unnecessary attorney's fees and costs. Respondent as filed at
23 least three objections.
24
25
26
27

1 **ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND**
2 **DECREED** that two prior objections were denied and now this objection filed
3 untimely is **DENIED**.
4

5 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that THIS
6 COURT ORDERS that Petitioner's request for attorney's fees and costs is
7 **GRANTED**. Counsel for Petitioner shall file a Memorandum of Fees and Costs,
8 submit an unredacted billing statement to Chambers, and submit a corresponding
9 Order for Attorney s Fees and Costs;
10

11 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
12 the Master's Recommendation from the October 27, 2020 hearing (**EXHIBIT 1**),
13

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020, SHALL be affirmed
2 and adopted. DAFS shall submit the Order with the appropriate findings.

3 ~~DATED this _____ day of _____, 2021.~~

4
5 Dated this 28th day of April, 2021

6 

7 DEE SMART BUTLER,
8 HONORABLE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
9 **3CA D82 1F4C 727F**
10 **Dee Smart Butler**
11 **District Court Judge**

12 Submitted By:

13 

14 COREY ROBERTS, ESQ.
15 DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
16 Nevada Bar No. 12482
17 FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
18 1900 East Flamingo Rd., Ste 100
19 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
20 (702) 671-9200
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1 MRAO
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
2 Nevada Bar No. 001565
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
3 1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168
(702) 671-9200
4 TTY and/or other relay services: 711
437763100A

District Court
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5 NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP SERVICES,)
6 (MALIKA COPPEDGE),)

Petitioner,)

Case No. 06R136990

7 vs.)

Department No. CHILD SUPPORT

8 KORI L CAGE,)

9 Respondent.)

10 **MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION**

11 This matter having been heard on **OCTOBER 27, 2020** before the undersigned Hearing Master, having considered all the
12 evidence and having been fully advised in the premises, hereby makes the following Findings and Recommendations:

13 Parties present: ☒ Respondent ☐ Respondent's attorney ☒ Petitioner ☒ Petitioner's attorney

14 ☐ PATERNITY ☒ PATERNITY PREVIOUSLY DECIDED

15 ☒ FINANCIALS: ☐ CONTINUE PRIOR ORDERS (NO CHANGE TO PRIOR FINANCIAL ORDERS).

16 Basis for adjustment from state formula: _____

Respondent is to pay current support for the child(ren), **Kyree Cage, Jayla Nicole Cage,**

17 **CHILD SUPPORT**

Respondent is to pay monthly:

18 \$268.00 child support

19 _____ medical support

_____ spousal support

_____ arrears payment

☐ ARREARAGES ☒ ARREARAGES NOT ADDRESSED AT THIS HEARING

20 \$ 268.00

TOTAL monthly payment is due on the 1st day of each month, and continues thereafter until said child(ren)
21 reach majority, become emancipated or further order of the Court.

22 Respondent's **INCOME SHALL BE WITHHELD** for the payment of support.

☐ Good cause to stay income withholding is based on: _____. Said withholding shall be postponed until Respondent
23 becomes delinquent in an amount equal to 30 days support.

24 ☐ ENFORCEMENT OF CONTROLLING ORDER: The registered order from _____, dated _____, #_____, is hereby
confirmed and is the controlling order for the following reasons: ☐ only order _____.

25 ☐ ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTROLLING ORDER: This is the first order establishing a child support obligation for this
noncustodial parent for the child(ren) listed in this order who reside(s) with this custodian.

26 ☒ Health insurance coverage for the minor child(ren) herein:

☒ Respondent to provide: ☐ Petitioner to provide: ☐ Both Parties to provide:

☒ if available through employer. ☐ shall provide per court order.

27 ☒ Ordered Party(ies) to provide proof of said insurance to the District Attorney's Office, Family Support Division
within 90 days of today's date.

28 Under the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid is acceptable coverage.

EXHIBIT 1

FINDING 1.6

☐ CONTEMPT OF COURT ☒ NOT A SHOW CAUSE HEARING

☒ MODIFICATION OF PRIOR ORDER:

☒ Modification effective: 10/1/2020.

☒ This order modifies a previously existing, previously controlling support order. By this modification, this tribunal assumes or retains continuing, exclusive jurisdiction of the child support obligation for the child(ren) and parties identified in this order. Modification is proper for the following reason(s):

☒ The previously controlling order is from Clark County, Nevada, dated April 23, 2018, #D-07-374223-P.

☒ An individual party, Kori Cage, has requested modification of the previously controlling Nevada support order.

☐ An individual party, _____, has requested modification; this tribunal has personal jurisdiction over the non-movant and the issuing state (the state whose order controlled prior to this modification) is no longer the residence of any individual party/contestant or child(ren).

☐ An individual party, _____, has requested modification; all individual parties and children now reside in Nevada.

☐ All parties have filed written consent with the tribunal whose order controlled prior to this modification for this tribunal to modify the support obligation and assume continuing, exclusive jurisdiction.

☐ SUSPENSION OF LICENSES:

PAYMENTS

All mailed payments MUST be made in the form of a cashier's check, money order or business check ONLY, made payable to State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU).

Payments can be mailed to:

State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU)

P.O. Box 98950

Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8950

Additionally, the following information must be included with each payment: name (first, middle, last) of person responsible for paying child support, social security number of person responsible for paying child support, child support case number, and name of petitioner (first and last name of person receiving child support).

NOTICE: NO CREDIT WILL BE GIVEN FOR PAYMENTS PAID DIRECTLY TO THE PETITIONER.

Please visit www.clarkcountynv.gov/district-attorney/fs for alternative payment options.

NOTICE: PRIOR ORDERS NOT SPECIFICALLY MODIFIED HEREIN REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT

NOTICE: Interest will be assessed on all unpaid child support balances for cases with a Nevada controlling order pursuant to NRS 99.040. If the Respondent pays support through income withholding and the full obligation is not met by the amount withheld by the employer, the Respondent is responsible to pay the difference between the court ordered obligation and the amount withheld by the employer directly to the state disbursement unit. If the Respondent fails to do so, he/she may be subject to assessment of interest. The Respondent may avoid these additional costs by making current support payments each month. If another state takes jurisdiction and obtains a new order, Nevada interest will only be calculated to the date of the new order and will be enforced.

NOTICE: Pursuant to NRS 125B.145 and federal law, EITHER parent, the legal guardian, and the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, where there is an assignment of support rights to the State, has the right to request a review of the support provision of this order at least every three (3) years to determine if modification is appropriate; an application for this purpose may be obtained from D.A. Family Support at 1900 E. Flamingo Rd., Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168.

NOTICE: Objections/Appeals are governed by EDCR1.40(e) and (f). You have ten (10) days from receipt of this Master's Recommendation to serve and file written objections to it. A failure to file and serve written objections will result in a final Order/Judgment being ordered by District Court.

NOTICE: Appeal from a Final Judgment by the Court is governed by NRAP 4 and must be filed within 30 days of written Notice of Entry of Judgment.

NOTICE: Respondent is responsible for notifying the District Attorney, Family Support Division, of any change of address, change of employment, health insurance coverage, change of custody, or any order relative to child support within ten (10) days of such change.

NOTICE: If you want to adjust the amount of child support established in this order, you MUST file a motion to modify the order with or submit a stipulation to the court. If a motion to modify the order is not filed or a stipulation is not submitted, the child support obligation established in this order will continue until such time as all children who are the subject of this order reach 18 years of age or, if the youngest child who is subject to this order is still in high school when he or she reaches 18 years of age, when the child graduates from high school or reaches 19 years of age, whichever comes first. Unless the parties agree otherwise in a stipulation, any modification made pursuant to a motion to modify the order will be effective as of the date the motion was filed.

Respondent to bring new financial statement and proof of income next date.

This order does not stay collection of support arrears by execution or any other means allowed by law.

MISCELLANEOUS FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Last payment- October 19, 2020 via UIB.

Parties have parallel Family District Court case, D-07-374223-P, wherein Petitioner was awarded Primary Physical Custody. See Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Judgment filed April 23, 2018. Nevada Supreme Court affirmed in part and reversed in part the order. See NV Supreme Court Clerk's Certificate/Judgment- Affd/Rev Part filed February 6, 2020.

Procedural History: Respondent requested modification based on a change of circumstance (20% change in income) pursuant to NRS 125B.145(4)/NAC 425.170(1). (1) December 13, 2019 set temporary order of \$323 per month based on GMI \$1,811 (25% of GMI = \$453) and downward deviation of \$65 per child per month for 2 additional children. Respondent is legally responsible for but continued the matter based on jurisdictional question as the Nevada Supreme Court had not issued a remittitur; temporary support order only to deal with contempt issue only. (2) March 13, 2020 hearing granted Respondent's request to reduce obligation, but left the obligation as temporary pending a hearing September 25, 2020 to determine Respondent's GMI as UIB may end September 2020. (3) July 6, 2020 and September 22, 2020 hearing dates were continued.

Respondent's prior Gross Monthly Income was \$3,262.44. A 20% change in income = \$652.49.

Respondent's current income via UIB to be \$418 per week x 52 weeks = annual income of \$21,736 / 12 months = Gross Monthly Income of \$1,811.33.

NAC 425 obligation for 2 children = \$398.49 (GMI: \$1,811.33 x 22%).


Respondent is legally responsible for 2 additional children, Kamryn Cage (03/26/2013); London Cage (02/09/2014), not of the relationship. \$130 deviation (\$65/month per child) discussed/considered at December 13, 2019 hearing. District Court's April 23, 2018 Judgment did not grant a deviation for other minor children.

Respondent receives Medicaid and Food stamps. Minor children have Medicaid under Respondent's public assistance program.

Childcare costs: none at this time.

NEXT HEARING DATE IS O/C in Courtroom in Child Support Court at Child Support Center of Southern Nevada, 1900 East Flamingo Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, for further proceedings.

DATED: OCTOBER 27, 2020



MASTER

USJR DISPOSITIONS

- ☒ - Settled/Withdrawn w/Judicial Conference/Hearing
☐ - Involuntary (Statutory) Dismissal
☐ - Dismissed / Want of Prosecution
☐ - Transferred to Another Jurisdiction
☐ - Other Manner of Dispo
☐ - Close Case

Respondent/Respondent's Attorney
 Receipt of this document is
 acknowledged by my signature.

ORDER/JUDGMENT

☐ The Clerk of the Court having reviewed the District Court's file and having determined that no objection has been filed within the ten day objection period, **the Master's Recommendation is hereby deemed approved by the District Court pursuant to NRS 425.3844.** The affixing of the Clerk of the Court's file stamp to this Master's Recommendation signifies that the ten-day objection period has expired without an objection having been filed and that the District Court deems the Master's Recommendation to be approved as an **ORDER/JUDGMENT** of the District Court, effective with the file stamp date, without need of a District Court Judge's signature affixed hereto. **The parties are ordered to comply with this Order/Judgment.**

☒ The District Court, having reviewed the above and foregoing Master's Recommendation, and having received and considered the objection thereto, as well as any other papers, testimony and argument related thereto and good cause appearing,

☒ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Master's Recommendation IS affirmed and adopted as an **ORDER/JUDGMENT** of the District Court this 28th day of April, 2021.

☐ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Master's Recommendation IS NOT affirmed and adopted this _____ day of _____, 20____ and this matter is remanded to Child Support Court on _____, 20____ at _____ M.


Dated this 28th day of April, 2021



District Court Judge, Family Division

6AB 233 6D14 7113
 Dee Smart Butler
 District Court Judge

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark County District Attorney
 Nevada Bar No. 001565

By: 
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION
1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-5168



CAS
KORI CAGE
8655 Rowland Bluff Ave
Las Vegas, Nevada 89178
Phone: (702) 771-2506
kcage01@gmail.com
Respondent in Proper Person

IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE
STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

KORI CAGE,

Appellant,

vs.

Case No. R136990
Dept No. J

NV DHHS DIV OF WELFARE & SUPP
SERVICES (MALIKA COPPEDGE),

Respondent.

CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

Pursuant to NRAP 3(f), Appellant, KORI CAGE, an individual, hereby
provides the following *Case Appeal Statement*:

1. **Name of appellant filing this case appeal statement (NRAP 3(f)(3)(C)):**
KORI CAGE, an individual.
2. **Identify the judge issuing the decision, judgment, or order appealed
from (NRAP 3(f)(3)(B)):**
Honorable Dee Smart Butler, Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of
Nevada in and for Las Vegas.

1 **3. Identify all parties to the proceedings in the district court (the use of et**
2 **al. to denote parties is prohibited) (NRAP 3(f)(3)(A)):**

- 3 (a) KORI CAGE, an individual;
4 (b) MALIKA COPPEDGE, an individual;
5 (c) DA, Steven B. Wolfson, Family Support Division

6 **4. Identify all parties involved in this appeal (the use of et al. to denote**
7 **parties is prohibited) (NRAP 3(f)(3)((C),(D)):**

- 8 (a) KORI CAGE, an individual; Pro Se
9 (b) MALIKA COPPEDGE, an individual;
10 (c) DA, Steven B. Wolfson, Family Support Division

11 **5. Set forth the name, law firm, address, and telephone number of all**
12 **counsel on appeal and identify the party or parties whom they represent**
13 **(NRAP 3(f)(3)(C), (D)):**

14 (a) Pro Se

15 *Counsel for Appellant, KORI CAGE*

16 (b) Brian E. Blackham

17 Nevada Bar No. 9974

18 GHAMDI DEETER BLACKHAM

19 725 South 8th Street, Suite 89101

20 Las Vegas, NV 89101

21 Telephone: (702) 878-1115

22 *Counsel for Respondent, MALIKA COPPEDGE*

23 (c) Leah Blakesley

24 Nevada Bar No. 12802

25 GHAMDI DEETER BLACKHAM

725 South 8th Street, Suite 89101

Las Vegas, NV 89101

Telephone: (702) 878-1115

Counsel for Respondent, MALIKA COPPEDGE

(d) Steven B. Wolfson

Nevada Bar No. 0001565

FAMILY SUPPORT DIVISION

1900 East Flamingo Road, Suite 100

Las Vegas, NV 89119

Telephone: (702) 671-9200

It appears to be: Counsel for Respondent, MALIKA COPPEDGE

1 **6. Indicate whether appellant was represented by appointed or retained**
2 **counsel in the district court (NRAP 3(f)(3)(F)):**

3 Appellant was NOT represented by retained counsel in district court.

4 **7. Indicate whether appellant is represented by appointed or retained**
5 **counsel on appeal (NRAP 3(f)(3)(F)):**

6 Appellant is NOT represented by retained counsel on appeal.

7 **8. Indicate whether appellant was granted leave to proceed in forma**
8 **pauperis, and the date of entry of the district court order granting such**
9 **leave (NRAP 3(f)(3)(G)):**

10 Appellant was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed February 25,
11 2021, in the SC # 82333 docket # 21-05627

12 **9. Indicate the date of the proceedings commenced in the district court**
13 **(e.g., date complaint, indictment, information, or petition was filed)**
14 **(NRAP 3(f)(3)(H)):**

15 *Petition was filed in the district court under NRS 238.100 (1) November 9th,*
16 *2020, Proceeding took place March 17, 2021*

17 **10. District court case number and caption showing the names of all parties**
18 **to the proceedings below, but the use of et al. to denote parties is**
19 **prohibited (NRAP 3(f)(3)(A)):**

20 (a) Case number:

21 Eighth Judicial District Court, Case number: 6R136990

22 Department: J

23 (b) Caption:

24 NV DHHS Division of Welfare & Supp Services

25 (MALIKA COPPEDGE), an individual,

Petitioner,

vs.

KORI LOVETT CAGE, an individual,

Respondent.

1 **11. Whether any of respondents' attorneys are not licensed to practice law**
2 **in Nevada, and, if so, whether the district court granted that attorney**
3 **permission to appear under SCR 42, including a copy of any district**
4 **court order granting that permission (NRAP 3(t)(3)(E)):**

Based upon information and belief, all attorneys for the Respondent are licensed to practice law in Nevada.

5 **12. Brief description of the nature of the action and result in district court,**
6 **including the type of judgment or order being appealed and the relief**
7 **granted by the district court (NRAP 3(f)(3)(1)):**

These underlying proceedings are a suit concerning child Support modification. Early September 2019, Appellant was terminated from his place of employment, through no fault of his own, consequently the Appellant started collecting unemployment benefits. On September 12th, 2019, Appellant Petitioned the DA's office to modify his child support obligation, motion filed in the UIFSA court November 4th, 2019.

On December 13, 2019, the UIFSA hearing master issued a temporary modification of Appellants child support obligation and ordered both parties to return with their 2018 and 2019 tax returns to consider relative income. Recommendations were temporary due to jurisdictional concerns pending the remittitur in the Supreme Court case # SCN76006, district court case # D07374223. A returning hearing was set for March 13, 2020.

- The remittitur was received by the district court February 6, 2020.
- Despite the plain language of NRS 125B.145 and the remittitur being received by the district court; hearing after hearing ensued regarding this matter and continues to this day.
- March 13, 2020, hearing was continued to July 6, 2020
- July 6, 2020, hearing was continued to September 25, 2020.
- September 25, 2020, hearing was moved forward to September 22, 2020.
- September 22, 2020, hearing was continued to October 27, 2020.
- Now the October 27, 2020, hearing is continued to June 28, 2021.

After objecting to the UIFSA court's recommendations after each compounding hearing under EDCR 1.40(e) and (f), the district court issued its Notice of Order on April 28, 2021, Ordering [1] attorney's fees to the Respondent and [2] not considering Appellant's argument for allegedly filing his objection untimely.

1 **13. Whether the case has previously been the subject of an appeal to or**
2 **original writ proceeding in the Supreme Court and, if so, the caption**
3 **and Supreme Court docket number of the prior proceeding (NRAP**
4 **3(f)(J)):**

Cage VS. Coppedge
SC Case # 82333

5 **14. Whether the appeal involves child custody or visitation (NRAP**
6 **3(f)(3)(K)):**

The appeal does NOT involve child custody or visitation.

7 **15. In civil cases, whether the appeal involves the possibility of settlement**
8 **(NRAP 3(f)(3)(L)):**

The appeal does not involve the possibility of settlement.

9
10 DATED this 10 day of June 2021

11
12 Pursuant to NRS 53.045, I declare under
13 penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true
14 and correct.

15 Kori Cage (signature)
16 KORI CAGE
17 Appellant, Pro se
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



1 ASTA

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 MALIKA COPPEDGE,

11 Petitioner(s)

12 vs.

13 KORI CAGE,

14 Respondent(s),

Case No: 06R136990

Dept No: J

16

17

CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1. Appellant(s): Kori Cage

2. Judge: Dee Smart Butler

3. Appellant(s): Kori Cage

Counsel:

Kori Cage
8655 Rowland Bluff Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89178

4. Respondent (s): Malika Coppedge

Counsel:

Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
725 S. 8th St., Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89101

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

- 5. Appellant(s)'s Attorney Licensed in Nevada: N/A
Permission Granted: N/A
- Respondent(s)'s Attorney Licensed in Nevada: Yes
Permission Granted: N/A
- 6. Has Appellant Ever Been Represented by Appointed Counsel In District Court: No
- 7. Appellant Represented by Appointed Counsel On Appeal: N/A
- 8. Appellant Granted Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis: Yes, February 22, 2021
Appellant Filed Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis: N/A
Date Application(s) filed: N/A
- 9. Date Commenced in District Court: November 4, 2006
- 10. Brief Description of the Nature of the Action: DOMESTIC - Miscellaneous
Type of Judgment or Order Being Appealed: Misc. Order
- 11. Previous Appeal: Yes
Supreme Court Docket Number(s): 82333
- 12. Case involves Child Custody and/or Visitation: N/A
Appeal involves Child Custody and/or Visitation: N/A
- 13. Possibility of Settlement: Unknown

Dated This 29 day of June 2021.

Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court

/s/ Heather Ungermann
Heather Ungermann, Deputy Clerk
200 Lewis Ave
PO Box 551601
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-1601
(702) 671-0512

cc: Kori Cage

ORDR
GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM

Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9974
Email: brian@ghandilaw.com
Leah M. Blakesley, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 12802
Email: leah@ghandilaw.com
725 S. 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 878-1115
Facsimile: (702) 979-2485
Attorneys for Petitioner

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

FAMILY DIVISION

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Nevada Dept. of Health & Human
Services, Div. of Welfare &
Supportive Services, and Malika
Coppedge,

Petitioner,

v.

Kori L. Cage,

Respondent.

Case No.: 06R136990
Dept. No.: CHILD SUPPORT/J

ORDER RE: AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES
AND COSTS TO PETITIONER

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court for an in-chambers
decision upon Petitioner's Memorandum of Attorney's Fees and Costs; with no

1 appearance being required by either party or their counsel; the Court having reviewed
2 the papers and pleadings on file herein, and being fully advised in the premises, and
3 good cause showing, hereby makes the following findings and orders:

4 THE COURT HEREBY FINDS that it has complete jurisdiction in the
5 premises, both as to the subject matter thereof and the parties hereto.

6 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that Petitioner Malika Coppedge (Malika)
7 filed her Memorandum of Attorney's Fees and Costs (Memorandum) on June 11,
8 2021, requesting an award of attorney's fees and costs in the amount of \$1,301.00 in
9 connection with Malika's Response to Kori's Objection and Appeal of the October
10 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations and Countermotion to Adopt Master's
11 Recommendations in Full, and for Attorney's Fees and Costs, filed on January 22,
12 2021.


13 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that no Objection by Kori has been filed, but
14 a Motion for Reconsideration was filed and was denied on June 16, 2021.

15 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that the Court has reviewed Malika's
16 Memorandum, and good cause exists pursuant to NRS 18.010(2) EDCR 7.60(b), and
17 EDCR 5.502(d) to grant Malika's request and enter an award for her attorney's fees
18 and costs. The attorney's fees awarded herein are reasonable under Brunzell v.
19 Golden Gate National Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969), based upon
20 the experience and qualifications of Malika's counsel, the challenges faced in this

1 case, and the result obtained in connection with Malika's Response to Kori's
2 Objection and Appeal of the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations and
3 Countermotion to Adopt Master's Recommendations in Full, and for Attorney's Fees
4 and Costs.

5 NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that pursuant to NRS
6 18.010(2) and EDCR 7.60(b) Malika is hereby awarded her attorney's fees and costs
7 in the amount of \$ 1301.00. This amount is hereby reduced to judgment in
8 favor of Malika and against Respondent, Kori Cage, and shall be collectible by any
9 lawful means.

Dated this 1st day of July, 2021



2B8 590 F96B E6DC
Dee Smart Butler
District Court Judge

12 Respectfully submitted by:

13 **GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM**

14 /s/ Leah M. Blakesley

15 Leah M. Blakesley, Esq.
16 Nevada Bar No. 12802
17 725 S. 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorney for Petitioner

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5
6 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s). CASE NO: 06R136990
7 vs. DEPT. NO. Department J
8 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).
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: 7/1/2021

15 Laura Deeter, Esq.	laura@ghandilaw.com
16 Brian Blackham, Esq.	brian@ghandilaw.com
17 Leah Blakesley, Esq.	leah@ghandilaw.com
18 Theresa Calabrese Vance	tcv@ghandilaw.com
19 Renee Humphrey	rmh@ghandilaw.com
20 Nedda Ghandi	nedda@ghandilaw.com
21 Public BY DAFS	DAFSLegalGroup@clarkcountyda.com
22 Brian Blackham, Jr.	bb2@ghandilaw.com
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	



1 **NEOJ**
2 **GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM**

3 Nedda Ghandi, Esq.
4 Nevada Bar No. 11137
5 Email: nedda@ghandilaw.com
6 725 S. 8th Street, Suite 100
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
8 Telephone: (702) 878-1115
9 Facsimile: (702) 979-2485
10 Attorneys for

11 **EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

12 **FAMILY DIVISION**

13 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

14 Nevada Dept. of Health & Human
15 Services, Div. of Welfare &
16 Supportive Services, and Malika
17 Coppedge,

18 Petitioner,

19 v.

20 Kori L. Cage,

Respondent.

Case No.: 06R136990

Dept. No.: CHILD SUPPORT/J

1 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER RE: AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES**
2 **AND COSTS TO PETITIONER**

3 **TO: ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:**

4 YOU ARE HEREBY NOTICED that an Order Re: Award of Attorney's Fees
5 and Costs to Petitioner was entered on the 1st day of July 2021.

1 A copy of said Order is attached hereto.

2 Dated this 2nd day of July 2021.

3 **GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM**

4 

5 Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
6 Nevada Bar No. 9974
7 725 S. 8th Street, Suite 100
8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
9 Attorney for Petitioner

8 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

9 I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 2nd day of July 2021, I served a copy of this
10 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER RE: AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES AND
11 COSTS TO PETITIONER, upon each of the parties and addressed to those counsel
12 of record:

- 13 ☒ Electronic Service to DAFS: DAFSLegalGropu@clarkcountyda.com
14 ☐ Via Facsimile to:
15 ☐ Via Email to:
16 ☒ Placing in the U.S. Mail, with postage fully prepaid, addressed to:

16 Steven B. Wolfson, DA	Kori Cage
17 Family Support Division	8655 Rowland Bluff Ave.
18 1900 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 100	Las Vegas, NV 89178
19 Las Vegas, NV 89119	Respondent

18 **/s/ Theresa Calabrese-Vance**

19 An employee of Ghandi Deeter Blackham

ORDR
GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM

Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9974
Email: brian@ghandilaw.com
Leah M. Blakesley, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 12802
Email: leah@ghandilaw.com
725 S. 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 878-1115
Facsimile: (702) 979-2485
Attorneys for Petitioner

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

FAMILY DIVISION

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Nevada Dept. of Health & Human
Services, Div. of Welfare &
Supportive Services, and Malika
Coppedge,

Petitioner,

v.

Kori L. Cage,

Respondent.

Case No.: 06R136990
Dept. No.: CHILD SUPPORT/J

ORDER RE: AWARD OF ATTORNEY'S FEES
AND COSTS TO PETITIONER

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court for an in-chambers
decision upon Petitioner's Memorandum of Attorney's Fees and Costs; with no

1 appearance being required by either party or their counsel; the Court having reviewed
2 the papers and pleadings on file herein, and being fully advised in the premises, and
3 good cause showing, hereby makes the following findings and orders:

4 THE COURT HEREBY FINDS that it has complete jurisdiction in the
5 premises, both as to the subject matter thereof and the parties hereto.

6 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that Petitioner Malika Coppedge (Malika)
7 filed her Memorandum of Attorney's Fees and Costs (Memorandum) on June 11,
8 2021, requesting an award of attorney's fees and costs in the amount of \$1,301.00 in
9 connection with Malika's Response to Kori's Objection and Appeal of the October
10 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations and Countermotion to Adopt Master's
11 Recommendations in Full, and for Attorney's Fees and Costs, filed on January 22,
12 2021.


13 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that no Objection by Kori has been filed, but
14 a Motion for Reconsideration was filed and was denied on June 16, 2021.

15 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that the Court has reviewed Malika's
16 Memorandum, and good cause exists pursuant to NRS 18.010(2) EDCR 7.60(b), and
17 EDCR 5.502(d) to grant Malika's request and enter an award for her attorney's fees
18 and costs. The attorney's fees awarded herein are reasonable under Brunzell v.
19 Golden Gate National Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969), based upon
20 the experience and qualifications of Malika's counsel, the challenges faced in this

1 case, and the result obtained in connection with Malika's Response to Kori's
2 Objection and Appeal of the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendations and
3 Countermotion to Adopt Master's Recommendations in Full, and for Attorney's Fees
4 and Costs.

5 NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that pursuant to NRS
6 18.010(2) and EDCR 7.60(b) Malika is hereby awarded her attorney's fees and costs
7 in the amount of \$ 1301.00. This amount is hereby reduced to judgment in
8 favor of Malika and against Respondent, Kori Cage, and shall be collectible by any
9 lawful means.

Dated this 1st day of July, 2021



2B8 590 F96B E6DC
Dee Smart Butler
District Court Judge

12 Respectfully submitted by:

13 **GHANDI DEETER BLACKHAM**

14 /s/ Leah M. Blakesley

15 Leah M. Blakesley, Esq.
16 Nevada Bar No. 12802
17 725 S. 8th Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorney for Petitioner

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5
6 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s). CASE NO: 06R136990
7 vs. DEPT. NO. Department J
8 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).
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: 7/1/2021

15 Laura Deeter, Esq.	laura@ghandilaw.com
16 Brian Blackham, Esq.	brian@ghandilaw.com
17 Leah Blakesley, Esq.	leah@ghandilaw.com
18 Theresa Calabrese Vance	tcv@ghandilaw.com
19 Renee Humphrey	rmh@ghandilaw.com
20 Nedda Ghandi	nedda@ghandilaw.com
21 Public BY DAFS	DAFSLegalGroup@clarkcountyda.com
22 Brian Blackham, Jr.	bb2@ghandilaw.com

23
24
25
26
27
28



1 ASTA

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 MALIKA COPPEDGE,

11 Petitioner(s)

12 vs.

13 KORI CAGE,

14 Respondent(s),

Case No: 06R136990

Dept No: J

16

17

CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1. Appellant(s): Kori Cage

2. Judge: Dee Smart Butler

3. Appellant(s): Kori Cage

Counsel:

Kori Cage
8655 Rowland Bluff Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89178

4. Respondent (s): Malika Coppedge

Counsel:

Brian E. Blackham, Esq.
725 S. 8th St., Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89101

06R136990

-1-

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

5. Appellant(s)'s Attorney Licensed in Nevada: N/A
Permission Granted: N/A
- Respondent(s)'s Attorney Licensed in Nevada: Yes
Permission Granted: N/A
6. Has Appellant Ever Been Represented by Appointed Counsel In District Court: No
7. Appellant Represented by Appointed Counsel On Appeal: N/A
8. Appellant Granted Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis: Yes, February 22, 2021
Appellant Filed Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis: N/A
Date Application(s) filed: N/A
9. Date Commenced in District Court: November 4, 2006
10. Brief Description of the Nature of the Action: DOMESTIC - Miscellaneous
Type of Judgment or Order Being Appealed: Misc. Order
11. Previous Appeal: Yes
Supreme Court Docket Number(s): 82333, 83148
12. Case involves Child Custody and/or Visitation: N/A
Appeal involves Child Custody and/or Visitation: N/A
13. Possibility of Settlement: Unknown

Dated This 7 day of July 2021.

Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court

/s/ Heather Ungermann
Heather Ungermann, Deputy Clerk
200 Lewis Ave
PO Box 551601
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-1601
(702) 671-0512

cc: Kori Cage

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
FAMILY DIVISION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

MALIKA COPPEDGE,

Applicant,

vs.

KORI L. CAGE,

Adverse Party.

CASE NO.: 06R136990


DEPARTMENT J

ORDER APPROVING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS


The Court has reviewed the Findings and Recommendations of the Hearing Master signed on June 16, 2021, served on June 16, 2021 and filed on June 16, 2021. No timely objection has been filed by any party in this matter. Good cause appearing, the Findings of Fact and Recommendations of the Hearing Master are hereby approved, and such Findings of Fact and Recommendations are hereby made an Order of the Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada, Juvenile Division.

Dated this _____ day of July, 2021.

Dated this 12th day of July, 2021



DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
1000 D. 200.4034C
Dee Smart Butler
District Court Judge


CLERK OF THE COURT

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
FAMILY DIVISION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

MALIKA COPPEDGE,

Applicant,

vs.

KORI L. CAGE,

Adverse Party.

CASE NO.: 06R136990

DEPARTMENT J

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This Court entered a Report and Recommendation concerning Respondent's child support obligation on October 17, 2020. Respondent Objected to the Report and Recommendation. Judge Butler denied the Objection and Affirmed the Report and Recommendation on April 28, 2021. Respondent also filed an Appeal of the Decision to the Nevada Supreme Court. The Supreme Court dismissed the Appeal on May 4, 2021.

Respondent has now filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the support decision affirmed by the District Court. Pursuant to EDCR 2.24, this motion needed to be filed within 14 days of this Court's prior decision. .

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that the Motion for Reconsideration be DENIED as it is untimely.

///

///

///

///

1 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED, that the hearing on June 29, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. be
2 VACATED.

3
4 Dated this 16th day of June, 2021.

5
6 
7 JON NORHEIM
8 Child Support Hearing Master

9
10 NOTICE

11
12 Pursuant to EDCR 1.40 (e) and (f), you are hereby notified you have 10 days from the date
13 from receipt of this document within which to file written objections thereto. You have 13 days
14 from the date this document is placed in counsel's folder or is mailed if those methods of service
15 are utilized.

16
17 CLERK'S CERTIFICATE SERVICE

18
19 I hereby certify on this 16th day of June, 2021, a copy of the Hearing Master's Decision was:

20 ☒ BY MAIL: a copy via first-class, postage fully prepaid - Ghandi Deeter Blackham
21 to: Atty for the Petitioner - 725 S. 8th St #100, Las Vegas NV
22 ☒ BY MAIL a copy via first-class, postage fully prepaid - 89101
23 to: Kori Cage - Respondent - 8655 Rowland Bluff Ave Las Vegas, NV
24 89178
25 BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: Chief Deputy District Attorney _____
26 DAFSLegalGroup@Clarkcountynyda.com

27
28 By: Katherine Kemp
Legal Secretary for Child Support

1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5
6 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s). CASE NO: 06R136990
7 vs. DEPT. NO. Department J
8 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).
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: 7/12/2021

15 Laura Deeter, Esq.	laura@ghandilaw.com
16 Brian Blackham, Esq.	brian@ghandilaw.com
17 Leah Blakesley, Esq.	leah@ghandilaw.com
18 Theresa Calabrese Vance	tcv@ghandilaw.com
19 Renee Humphrey	rmh@ghandilaw.com
20 Nedda Ghandi	nedda@ghandilaw.com
21 Public BY DAFS	DAFSLegalGroup@clarkcountyda.com
22 Brian Blackham, Jr.	bb2@ghandilaw.com
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

NEO

Electronically Filed
7/15/2021 1:38 PM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT



DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

MALIKA COPPEDGE,

Petitioner,

vs.

KORI L CAGE,

Respondent

Case No.: 06R136990

Department: S

**NOTICE OF ENTRY
OF ORDER**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an ORDER was filed on the 12 day of July 12, 2021 in the
above entitled matter a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 15TH day of July, 2021 :

☒ Mailed, via first-class mail, postage fully prepaid the foregoing Notice of Entry of Order to:
Ghandi Deeter Blackham, Attorneys for the Petitioner 725 S 8th Street, Ste 100, Las Vegas,
NV 8910

☒ Mailed, via first-class mail, postage fully prepaid the foregoing Notice of Entry of Order to:
Kori Cage, Respondent, 8655 S Rowland Bluff Ave, Las Vegas NV 89178

☒ By Electronic Mail: Notice of Entry Order to: DAFSLEGALGROUP@clarkcountynvda.com

By


Legal Secretary for Child Support

Alvin S. Smith
CLERK OF THE COURT

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
FAMILY DIVISION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

MALIKA COPPEDGE,

CASE NO.: 06R136990

Applicant,

vs.

DEPARTMENT J

KORI L. CAGE,

Adverse Party.

ORDER APPROVING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Court has reviewed the Findings and Recommendations of the Hearing Master signed on June 16, 2021, served on June 16, 2021 and filed on June 16, 2021. No timely objection has been filed by any party in this matter. Good cause appearing, the Findings of Fact and Recommendations of the Hearing Master are hereby approved, and such Findings of Fact and Recommendations are hereby made an Order of the Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada, Juvenile Division.

~~Dated this _____ day of July, 2021.~~

Dated this 12th day of July, 2021

Dee Smart Butler

**100 ASD Case# 64C
Dee Smart Butler
District Court Judge**

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA **COURT MINUTES** **April 05, 2007**

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
vs.
Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

April 05, 2007 9:30 AM Hearing

HEARD BY: Beller, Sylvia

COURTROOM: Courtroom 09

COURT CLERK: Patricia Eiring

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, not present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- COURT CLERK: Patty Eiring

Both parties sworn and testified. MASTER FINDS, Respondent's GMI is \$2,437.50 x 18% equals \$438.75. MASTER RECOMMENDED, Respondent to pay \$369.00 per month CURRENT SUPPORT payable on the 30th of each month with the first payment due on 4/30/07. WAGE WITHHOLDING RECOMMENDED.

Respondent is CONFIRMED as the NATURAL FATHER of the minor child by AFFIDAVIT OF PATERNITY.

Respondent to provide HEALTH INSURANCE for the minor child(ren) if available through an employer (already provided for the child(ren)).

MASTER FINDS AND RECOMMENDED, Employer-reported wages for April 2006 thru December 2006, from Enterprise Leasing (Rentacar) yield average gross monthly income of \$2,767.37. Respondent's testimony was that he earns \$11.25 per hour at 50 hours per week which is a gross

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 1 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

06R136990

monthly income of \$2,437.50.

Respondent has a newborn child. A copy of the birth certificate or Affidavit of Paternity to be provided to DA within 30 days. A deviation of \$70.00 per month.

Regarding HEALTH INSURANCE, once Respondent provides DA with PROOF of the COST of the HEALTH INSURANCE for the child only, then DA will provide an offset effective April 2007. Regarding ARREARS, Petitioner does not request back child support. Matter is OFF CALENDAR.

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 2 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA	COURT MINUTES	May 29, 2007
-------------------	----------------------	---------------------

06R136990	Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s). vs. Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).
-----------	---

May 29, 2007	10:30 AM	Objection - UIFSA
---------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

HEARD BY: Kent, Lisa M

COURTROOM: Courtroom 04

COURT CLERK:
PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, not present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, not present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, not present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Court Clerk: Vickie Warren

The moving documents not being in the file (please see Clerk's note), COURT ORDERED, matter OFF CALENDAR.

CLERK'S NOTE: The DA's office along with respondent advised the Law Clerk that an opposition had been filed by the District Attorney's office on 4/19/07; there was proper service of the objection; and they were ready to go today. The opposition is not showing as filed in Odyssey; the Calendar Clerk could not locate the objection or the opposition despite spending an entire day looking for same; and the Clerk's Office did not scan either the objection or opposition into Odyssey. The Law Clerk advised the District Attorney's office to contact a supervisor at the Clerk's Office re. locating the documents.

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 3 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

06R136990

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 4 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA

COURT MINUTES

June 12, 2007

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
vs.
Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

June 12, 2007 10:30 AM Objection - UIFSA

HEARD BY: Kent, Lisa M

COURTROOM: Courtroom 04

COURT CLERK: Vickie Warren

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, present

Pro Se

Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present

Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, present

Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present

Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present

Public by DAFS, Other, not present

Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Court Clerk: Vickie Warren

Statements by the Deft in regards to filing a Motion to Change Custody and withdrawing his Objection to Master's Recommendations.

Based on the Repondent's request, COURT ORDERED, Objection WITHDRAWN.

Atty Ewert to prepare the order.

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 5 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA

COURT MINUTES

December 13, 2019

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
 vs.
 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

December 13, 2019 9:15 AM

**Motion for Review and
Adjustment of Child
Support**

HEARD BY: Henry, Jennifer

COURTROOM: Greystone Courtroom #1

COURT CLERK: Doreen Colarusso

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, present

Pro Se

Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present

Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, present

Brian Blackham, Attorney, present

Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present

Public by DAFS, Other, present

Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Deputy District Attorney (DDA), Karen Cliffe, present.

Parties sworn and testified.

Parties matter in their domestic case was on appeal. There was an appellate decision made on 11/15/19; however, the remitter had not been received. Counsel represented Respondent filed a request for rehearing/reconsideration. Court and Counsel are of the opinion this court has no jurisdiction at this time to hear any issues in this matter.

Based upon the remitter issue, DDA and Attorney Blackham agree, and Respondent argues he needs at least a temporary reprieve from current support to avoid contempt. DDA reported Respondent's prior gross monthly income was \$3,262.00. Respondent is receiving \$418.00 per week from unemployment benefits. Respondent now has Medicaid for the children, which has been approved December 2019 through February 2020.

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 6 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

COURT FINDS, Respondent's gross monthly income is $\$1,811.00 \times 25\% = \453.00 . A downward deviation of \$65.00 per month, per child given for Respondent's two other children. Parties stipulated to avoid contempt, Respondent's child support obligation is temporarily adjusted.

MASTER RECOMMENDED, MODIFICATION is hereby TEMPORARILY GRANTED effective 12/1/19. Respondent to PAY \$323.00 per month CURRENT SUPPORT. Until the Court is clear on the remitter issue or until further Order, the underlying amount remains unchanged. Any further permanent modification will be effective 12/1/19. No arrears payment is being set pending the next court date.

FURTHER, at the next hearing, the Court and/or attorneys are to research the remitter jurisdiction issue if the case is still at the appellate court. The domestic case to be consulted for any new orders regarding the impact of the portion that was remanded. The issues that have been raised in the motion and countermotion are all still ripe for determination. Next date, both parties to bring current pay information (paystubs, 2018 and 2019 tax returns and supporting documents).

MATTER CONTINUED

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 7 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA

COURT MINUTES

March 13, 2020

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
vs.
Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

**March 13, 2020 9:00 AM Motion for Review and
Adjustment of Child
Support**

HEARD BY: Teuton, Sylvia

COURTROOM: Greystone Courtroom #1

COURT CLERK: Jasmine Byers

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Deputy District Attorney (DDA): Monet Woods

Both parties present. Petitioner represented by counsel Leah Blakesley bar #12802 appearing retained.

Today's hearing is a Motion for Review and Adjustment of Child Support and the last payment was received on March 2, 2020 via Unemployment Insurance Benefits (UIB). DDA stated that the Respondent's unemployment ending September 2020. Respondent testified that he is diligently looking for work. Petitioner counsel represented that the Respondent needs to provide Medicaid cards to her client. Respondent requested to retroactively modify support beyond the filing date. Petitioner counsel requested attorney fees. Respondent testified that he has two other minor children. Petitioner counsel represented that her client has sporadic income.

COURT FINDS: Respondent is provide copies of Medicaid cards to the District Attorney Family Support (DAFS) social work department within 30 days. Respondent's request to retroactively

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 8 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

06R136990

modify support be the filing date of the motion is hereby DENIED. Petitioner's request for attorney fees is hereby DENIED. Respondent's request for further consideration of a reduction in support, such as this court consider the income of Petitioner, is DENIED. Respondent's request to reduce support has been GRANTED. Respondent shall PAY \$323.00 per month TEMPORARY CURRENT SUPPORT.

MASTER RECOMMENDED, ARREARS are \$2,729.18 and REDUCED to JUDGMENT. MODIFICATION is GRANTED effective December 1, 2019. Respondent shall PROVIDE HEALTH INSURANCE for the minor children.

MATTER CONTINUED

Minutes typed by : Courtroom Clerk trainee; Jasmine Byers

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS: Mar 13, 2020 9:00AM Motion for Review and Adjustment of Child Support
Greystone Courtroom #1 Teuton, Sylvia

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 9 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA

COURT MINUTES

June 03, 2020

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
 vs.
 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

June 03, 2020 10:00 AM Objection - UIFSA

HEARD BY: Hughes, Rena G.

COURTROOM: Chambers

COURT CLERK: Tiffany Skaggs

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, not present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, not present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, not present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- MINUTE ORDER - NO HEARING HELD

IC Decision 6/3/20

06R136990

Coppedge v Cage

NRCP 1 and EDCR 1.10 state that the procedure in district courts shall be administered to secure efficient, speedy, and inexpensive determinations in every action. Pursuant to EDCR 2.23(c) and 5.501(b), this Court can consider a motion and issue a decision on the papers at any time without a hearing. Further, pursuant to EDCR 2.20(c), this Court can grant the requested relief if there is no opposition timely filed.

On March 13, 2020 the parties had a hearing on a Motion for Review and Adjustment of Child Support. At the hearing, the Master recommended: arrears are \$2,729.18 and are reduced to judgment. Modification is granted effective December 1, 2019. Respondent shall provide health insurance for the minor children. Matter continued.

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 10 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

On March 30, 2020 Respondent filed an Objection and Appeal of the March 13, 2020 Master's Recommendation. The Objection came on for consideration on the Court's in chambers calendar on June 3, 2020. This Court has read and considered the current underlying pleadings in this matter and finds no clear error in the Hearing Master's recommendation. Therefore Respondent's Objection is hereby DENIED.

Clerk's note, a copy, of today's minute order was emailed, to counsel, Respondent and DAFS, at the e-mail addresses, on file.

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 11 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA	COURT MINUTES	July 06, 2020
-------------------	----------------------	----------------------

06R136990	Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s). vs. Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).
-----------	---

July 06, 2020	10:00 AM	Motion for Review and Adjustment of Child Support
----------------------	-----------------	--

HEARD BY: Mastin, Amy M.**COURTROOM:** Greystone Courtroom #1**COURT CLERK:** Bridgett Ward**PARTIES:**

Kori Cage, Respondent, present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Minutes were typed by Courtroom Clerk, Bridgett Ward

Deputy District Attorney (DDA): Shannon Russell

Parties sworn and testified. Parties participated via telephonically. Petitioner was represented by Counsel Leah Blakesley (#12802)

Today's hearing is a Motion for Review and Adjustment of Child Support. DDA advised no decision on Respondent's objection filed. Counsel Blakesley stated Respondent has not provided health cards to Petitioner. Respondent testified he should not have to give cards to Petitioner. DDA requested a return hearing.

COURT FINDS: The Court is not making any changes to current Orders. The Order remains until there is an Objection that modifies or nullifies the Order.

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 12 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

06R136990

MASTER RECOMMENDED: Respondent is given an additional 10 days to comply with the March 13, 2020 Order to provide health insurance cards.

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 13 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA

COURT MINUTES

September 16, 2020

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
 vs.
 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

September 16, 10:00 AM All Pending Motions
2020

HEARD BY: Hughes, Rena G.

COURTROOM: Chambers

COURT CLERK: Tiffany Skaggs

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, not present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, not present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, not present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- MINUTE ORDER - NO HEARING HELD

IC Decision 9/16/20

06R136990

Coppedge v Cage

NRCP 1 and EDCR 1.10 state that the procedure in district courts shall be administered to secure efficient, speedy, and inexpensive determinations in every action. Pursuant to EDCR 2.23(c) and 5.501(b), this Court can consider a motion and issue a decision on the papers at any time without a hearing. Further, pursuant to EDCR 2.20(c), this Court can grant the requested relief if there is no opposition timely filed.

This matter came on for consideration on the Court's in chambers calendar for a review of Respondent's Objection and Appeal of the July 6, 2020 Master's Recommendations. This Court has read and considered the current underlying pleadings in this matter. Respondent's Objection is

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 14 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

06R136990

hereby denied and the Master s Recommendation is hereby affirmed.

Clerk's Notes: A copy of the Minute Order was emailed to Counsel and Respondent's emails on file.

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 15 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA

COURT MINUTES

September 22, 2020

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
 vs.
 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

**September 22, 9:30 AM Motion for Review and
2020 Adjustment of Child
Support**

HEARD BY: Mastin, Amy M.

COURTROOM: Greystone Courtroom #1

COURT CLERK: Jasmine Byers

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, not present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Deputy District Attorney (DDA): Gerard Constantian

Petitioner sworn and testified. The court attempted to call the Respondent ; however, the call was answer by the voicemail. Petitioner attorney Brian Blackman #1280 appearing unbundled.

DDA reported that today's hearing is a motion for review and adjustment of child support. DDA stated that the Family Court denied the Respondent's objection to the previous MROJ. DDA stated that the Respondent was given short notice for today's hearing.

COURT FINDS: Respondent did not have sufficient notice for today's hearing after the Court moved the hearing date.

MASTER RECOMMENDS: MATTER CONTINUED

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 16 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

06R136990

Minutes typed by :Courtroom Clerk trainee; Jasmine Byers

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 17 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA

COURT MINUTES

October 27, 2020

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
 vs.
 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

October 27, 2020 9:00 AM **Motion for Review and
Adjustment of Child
Support**

HEARD BY: Mastin, Amy M.

COURTROOM: Greystone Courtroom #1

COURT CLERK: Bridgett Ward

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Minutes were typed by Courtroom Clerk, Bridgett Ward

Deputy District Attorney (DDA): Corey Roberts

Parties sworn and testified. Parties participated via telephonically. Petitioner was represented by Counsel Lea Blakesley (#12802).

Today's hearing is a Motion of Review and Adjustment of Child Support. DDA advised Respondent receives Unemployment Insurance Benefits (UIB) of \$418 per week. Respondent's Gross Monthly Income is \$1,811.33. Respondent's last payment was 10/19/20. Wage Withholding in place for UIB. Counsel Blakesley stated Respondent may have additional income he is not reporting. Respondent testified he has two other children. Respondent stated he is not receiving any additional income. Respondent stated he receives Food Stamps and Medicaid. Counsel requested effective date should be 11/1/20. DDA requested a return hearing.

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 18 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

06R136990

COURT FINDS: Respondent's GMI is \$1,811.33. Respondent given a deviation of \$130 per month for support of others. Respondent shall PAY \$268.00 per month CURRENT SUPPORT.
MODIFICATION EFFECTIVE October 1, 2020. No daycare at this time.

MASTER RECOMMENDED: Respondent shall PROVIDE HEALTH INSURANCE for the minor child(ren). Matter OFF CALENDAR.

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS: Oct 27, 2020 9:00AM Motion for Review and Adjustment of Child Support
Greystone Courtroom #1 Mastin, Amy M.

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 19 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

DA - UIFSA

COURT MINUTES

March 17, 2021

06R136990 Malika Coppedge, Petitioner(s).
 vs.
 Kori L Cage, Respondent(s).

March 17, 2021 2:10 PM Minute Order

HEARD BY: Butler, Dee Smart

COURTROOM: Chambers

COURT CLERK: Ameiona Ratcliff

PARTIES:

Kori Cage, Respondent, not present	Pro Se
Kyree Cage, Subject Minor, not present	
Malika Coppedge, Petitioner, not present	Brian Blackham, Attorney, not present
Nevada State Welfare, Other, not present	
Public by DAFS, Other, not present	Steven Wolfson, Attorney, not present

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- MINUTE ORDER - NO HEARING HELD

06R136990

Coppedge v Cage

NRCP 1 and EDCR 1.10 state that the procedure in district courts shall be administered to secure efficient, speedy, and inexpensive determinations in every action. Pursuant to EDCR 2.23(c) and 5.501(b), this Court can consider a motion and issue a decision on the papers at any time without a hearing. Further, pursuant to EDCR 2.20(c), this Court can grant the requested relief if there is no opposition timely filed.

On October 27, 2020, Notice of Entry of Master's Recommendation was filed after a hearing on that same date. Notice of the Master's Recommendation was mailed to Respondent Cage on October 27, 2020. It is unclear when Respondent received the Notice of Recommendation. On November 30, 2020, Respondent filed an Objection to the October 27, 2020 Master's Recommendation. On January

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 20 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

07, 2021, the Child Support Division of the District Attorneys' Office filed a Response to Respondent Cage's Objection and Appeal to Master's Recommendation. On January 22, 2021, Petitioner Coppedge filed a Response to Respondent's Objection and Appeal of the Recommendation and Countermotion to Adopt Master's Recommendations in Full and for Attorney's Fees and Costs. On February 23, 2021, Respondent filed a Reply to the District Attorney's Response and Petitioner's Response to Respondent's Objection. All pleadings were reviewed by the court and THE COURT FINDS:

Per NRS 425.3844(2), a recommendation entered by a master must be furnished to each party at the conclusion of the proceedings or as soon thereafter as possible. Within ten (10) days after receipt of the recommendation, any party may file with the District Court and serve upon the other parties a notice of objection to the recommendation. Pursuant to NRS 425.3844(3) if the objection is not filed within 10 days of receipt of the recommendation, the recommendation entered by the master shall be deemed approved by the District Court, and the clerk of the District Court may file the recommendation and judgement may be entered. Here, the Master's Recommendation based on the October 27, 2020 hearing was filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020. No objection had been filed by date. On November 30, 2020, eleven (11) days after the Recommendation was filed by the clerk of the District Court and deemed approved by the District Court, Respondent Cage filed his Objection to the Recommendation.

EDCR 1.40(e) addresses Child Support Masters specifically. Accordingly, either party has ten (10) days after the conclusion of the proceeding and receipt of the report to file and serve an objection to recommendations of child support masters.

Per NRCP 53(f)(1)(A), a party may file and serve objections to masters report and recommendations (generally) within fourteen (14) days.

NRCP 6(a)(1)(B) addresses the computation of time for filing motion papers. Parties are to exclude the day of the event that triggers the period, count every day, including intermediate weekends and holidays.

Respondent Cage argues that his Objection was filed timely.

THIS COURT FINDS that Respondent's argument that the October 27, 2020 hearing date must be excluding when calculating time is correct.

THIS COURT FINDS that Respondent's argument that the parties should acknowledge time for receipt of the Recommendation sent to him via mail and time for the clerk of the District Court to receive his Objection mailed to the court is persuasive and correct. However, considering all arguments regarding whether Respondent's Objection was filed timely, the deadline to file an Objection was November 6, 2020 per the ten (10) day rule. Even allowing for the fourteen (14) day rule, the deadline would have been November 10, 2020.

Furthermore, giving Respondent grace regarding potential delays in receipt of the Recommendation

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 21 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

via mail and mailing his Objection, the clerk filed the Recommendation on November 19, 2020, thirteen (13) days after the ten (10) day deadline and nine (9) days after the fourteen (14) day deadline. Even giving Respondent Cage three or four days for possible mail delays each way, the Objection was not filed until November 30, 2020. The November 30, 2020 date is twenty-four (24) days beyond the ten (10) day deadline and twenty (20) days beyond the 14 day deadline. Respondent Cage has filed numerous pleadings in this matter since 2019, including pleadings to the Supreme Court of Nevada. Respondent is aware of filing deadlines and must adhere to them.

THIS COURT FINDS that Respondent Cage s Objection was filed untimely and will not be considered.

Furthermore, per NRCP 53(e)(2) and EDCR 1.40(d), the District Court SHALL accept the Master s Recommendations unless clearly erroneous. The clearly erroneous standard of review generally means that the reviewing court must have a definite and firm conviction that a mistake was committed. No such finding can be made here.

Lastly, Petitioner Coppedge alleges that Respondent Cage has increased litigation costs which caused a financial burden and forced her to incur unnecessary attorney s fees and costs. Respondent as filed at least three objections. Two prior objections were denied and now this objection filed untimely is DENIED.

THIS COURT ORDERS that Petitioner s request for attorney s fees and costs is GRANTED. Counsel for Petitioner shall file a Memorandum of Fees and Costs, submit an unredacted billing statement to Chambers, and submit a corresponding Order for Attorney s Fees and Costs.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Master s Recommendation from the October 27, 2020 hearing, filed by the clerk of the District Court on November 19, 2020, SHALL be affirmed and adopted. DAFS shall submit the Order with the appropriate findings.

CLERK'S NOTE: On 4/21/2021 a copy of the Court's Minute Order was provided to each Attorney or Parties 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. (ajr)

INTERIM CONDITIONS:

FUTURE HEARINGS:

PRINT DATE:	08/20/2021	Page 22 of 22	Minutes Date:	April 05, 2007
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

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

Certification of Copy and Transmittal of Record

State of Nevada }
County of Clark } SS:

Pursuant to the Supreme Court order dated August 6, 2021, I, Steven D. Grierson, the Clerk of the Court of the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of the complete trial court record for the case referenced below. The record comprises three volumes with pages numbered 1 through 687.

MALIKA COPPEDGE,

Petitioner(s),

vs.

KORI CAGE,

Respondent(s),


Case No: 06R136990

Dept. No: J

now on file and of record in this office.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto
Set my hand and Affixed the seal of the
Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada
This 20 day of August 2021.

Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court



Heather Ungermann, Deputy Clerk

