

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

INDICATE FULL CAPTION:

State of Nevada Employment Security
Division et al.,

vs

Kelly Eppinger, Respondent

No. 83322

Electronically Filed
Aug 31 2021 03:49 p.m.

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

WARNING

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

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

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

1. Judicial District Eighth Department XV
County Clark Judge Joe Hardy
District Ct. Case No. A-20-826310-P

2. Attorney filing this docketing statement:

Attorney Troy Curtis Jordan Telephone 775-684-3996
Firm DETR/Employment Security Division, State of Nevada
Address 500 E. Third St
Carson City, NV 89713

Client(s) Employment Security Division, State of Nevada, Luynda Parven, J. Thomas Susich

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

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

Attorney Elizabeth Carmona Telephone 702-386-0404
Firm Nevada Legal Services
Address 530 S. Sixth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Client(s) Kelly Eppinger

Attorney _____ Telephone _____
Firm _____
Address _____

Client(s) _____

(List additional counsel on separate sheet if necessary)

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

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

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

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

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

N/A

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

Eppinger vs ESD et al 8th Judicial District Court case number A-20-826310-P.

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

This is an appeal from the granting a petition for judicial review which reversed an agency determination denying unemployment benefits

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

1) Can a district judge overrule a credibility determination made by the agency's administrative law judge who observed the witness testify and make its own credibility determination on appeal

2) Can a district judge invalidate factual findings made by an agency and substitute contrary factual findings of his own in a judicial review proceedings on appeal

3) Was the decision of the Employment Security Division denying unemployment benefits supported by substantial evidence

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

N/A

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

☒ N/A

☐ Yes

☐ No

If not, explain:

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

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

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

☐ A substantial issue of first impression

☐ An issue of public policy

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

☐ A ballot question

If so, explain:

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

This case is presumptively assigned to the Court of Appeals per NRAP 17(9)

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

N/A

Was it a bench or jury trial? _____

N/A

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

N/A

TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

16. Date of entry of written judgment or order appealed from 6-29-2021

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

17. Date written notice of entry of judgment or order was served 7-6-2021

Was service by:

☐ Delivery

☒ Mail/electronic/fax

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

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

☐ NRCP 50(b) Date of filing _____

☐ NRCP 52(b) Date of filing _____

☐ NRCP 59 Date of filing _____

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

(b) Date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion _____

(c) Date written notice of entry of order resolving tolling motion was served _____

Was service by:

☐ Delivery

☐ Mail

19. Date notice of appeal filed 7-30-2021

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

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

NRS 233B.150 and NRAP(4)(a)

SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY

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

(a)

☐ NRAP 3A(b)(1)

☐ NRS 38.205

☐ NRAP 3A(b)(2)

☒ NRS 233B.150

☐ NRAP 3A(b)(3)

☐ NRS 703.376

☐ Other (specify) _____

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

NRS 233B.150 states an aggrieved party may obtain a review of any final judgment of the district court by appeal to the appellate court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to the rules fixed by the Supreme Court pursuant to Section 4 of Article 6 of the Nevada Constitution. The appeal shall be taken as in other civil cases

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

(a) Parties:

State of Nevada Employment Security Division (ESD)
Lynda Parven, ESD Administrator
J. Thomas Susich, Chairmen of the ESD Board of Review
Kelly Eppinger, Claimant

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

The employer Linden and Associates never made an appearance in District Court and is not expected to participate in the proceedings

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

All ESD Appellants share the same claims of whether the agency determination was supported by substantial evidence in denying benefits and was established Nevada Law violated when the district court invalidated a credibility finding by the agency and made its own factual determinations contrary to those of agency and substituted its judgment for that of the agency.

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

(a) Specify the claims remaining pending below:

(b) Specify the parties remaining below:

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

☐ Yes

☐ No

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

☐ Yes

☐ No

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

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

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

VERIFICATION

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

Employment Security Division

Name of appellant

Troy Curtis Jordan

Name of counsel of record

8-26-2021

Date


Signature of counsel of record

Carson City, Nevada

State and county where signed

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 31st day of August, 2021, I served a copy of this completed docketing statement upon all counsel of record:

☐ By personally serving it upon him/her; or

☒ By mailing it by first class mail with sufficient postage prepaid to the following address(es): (NOTE: If all names and addresses cannot fit below, please list names below and attach a separate sheet with the addresses.)

Kristine Kuzemka
1180 N. Town Center Drive, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89144

Elizabeth Carmona
530 S. Sixth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Dated this 31st day of August, 2021



Signature

RECEIVED

12/17/2020

Nevada DETR/ ESD
Office of Legal Counsel

Electronically Filed
12/14/2020 12:02 PM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT



1 PTJR

2 Elizabeth S. Carmona, Esq.

3 Nevada State Bar No. 14687

4 NEVADA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.

5 530 South 6th Street

6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

7 Telephone: (702) 386-0404, ext. 128

8 Facsimile: (702) 388-1641

9 ecarmona@nlslaw.net

10 Attorney for Petitioner

CASE NO: A-20-826310-P
Department 15

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

11 KELLY EPPINGER,

12 Petitioner,

13 vs.

14 EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION,
15 STATE OF NEVADA and KIMBERLY GAA,
16 in her capacity as Administrator of the
17 EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION;
18 J. THOMAS SUSICH, in his capacity as
19 Chairperson of the EMPLOYMENT
SECURITY DIVISION BOARD OF REVIEW,
and LINDEN & ASSOCIATES PC,
as employer,

Respondents.

) CASE NO.

) DEPT. NO.

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Petitioner, KELLY EPPINGER, petitions the court to review the decision of the
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION BOARD OF REVIEW, dated December 3, 2020,
finding Petitioner ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits, and alleges as follows:

1. That the decision was not supported by substantial evidence.
2. That the decision was arbitrary and capricious.
3. That the decision was marked by an abuse of discretion.
4. That the decision was improper as a matter of law.

1 WHEREFORE, the Petitioner, KELLY EPPINGER, prays for the following relief:

2 1. That the decision of the EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION BOARD OF
3 REVIEW be reversed, and the Petitioner be determined to be eligible for unemployment
4 insurance benefits for which she has applied.


5
6 2. That this court grant such other and further relieve as may be just, equitable and
7 proper.

8 DATED this 11th day of December, 2020.

9
10 Respectfully submitted,

11
12 
13

14 Elizabeth S. Carmona, Esq.
15 Nevada State Bar No. 14687
16 **NEVADA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.**
17 530 South 6th Street
18 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
19 Telephone: (702) 386-0404, ext. 128
20 Facsimile: (702) 388-1641
21 ecarmona@nlslaw.net
22 *Attorney for Petitioner*
23
24
25
26
27
28



NEO
ELIZABETH S. CARMONA, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 14687
NEVADA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.
530 South Sixth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: (702) 386-0404, ext. 128
Facsimile: (702) 388-1641
Attorney for Petitioner

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

KELLY EPPINGER,

Petitioner,

**Case No.: A-20-826310-P
Dept No.: XV**

vs.

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION,
STATE OF NEVADA;
KIMBERLY GAA [now, LYNDIA PARVEN],
in her capacity as Administrator of the
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION; J.
THOMAS SUSICH, in his capacity as
Chairperson the EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
DIVISION BOARD OF REVIEW; and
LINDEN AND ASSOCIATES PC,
as employer,

Respondents.

TO: EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION, STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent;

TO: KIMBERLY GAA [now. LYNDIA PARVEN], Respondent;

TO: J. THOMAS SUSICH, Respondent; and

TO: LINDEN AND ASSOCIATES PC, Respondent;

YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on the 29th day of June, 2021, an Order was
entered in the above-entitled action, a copy of which is attached hereto.

///

1 DATED this 30th day of June, 2021.

2 Respectfully submitted,

3
4 By:



5 ELIZABETH S. CARMONA, ESQ.
6 Nevada State Bar No. 14687
7 **NEVADA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.**
8 530 South Sixth Street
9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
10 Telephone: (702) 386-0404, ext. 128
11 Facsimile: (702) 388-1641
12 ecarmona@nlslaw.net
13 *Attorney for Petitioner*
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

TROY C. JORDAN, ESQ.
500 EAST THIRD STREET
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89713

DATED this 30th day of June, 2021.



-3-

ORDR

ELIZABETH S. CARMONA, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 14687
NEVADA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.
530 South Sixth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: (702) 386-0404, ext. 128
Facsimile: (702) 388-1641
ecarmona@nslaw.net
Attorney for Petitioner

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

KELLY EPPINGER,

Petitioner,

**Case No.: A-20-826310-P
Dept No.: XV**

vs.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION,
STATE OF NEVADA;
KIMBERLY GAA [now, LYNDIA PARVEN],
in her capacity as Administrator of the
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION; J.
THOMAS SUSICH, in his capacity as
Chairperson the EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
DIVISION BOARD OF REVIEW; and
LINDEN AND ASSOCIATES PC,
as employer,

Respondents.

ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

This matter, concerning the decision of the BOARD OF REVIEW, EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION, STATE OF NEVADA issued on December 3, 2020 and petitioned for Judicial Review by KELLY EPPINGER on December 11, 2020, was considered by Department XV of the Eighth Judicial District Court, in and for Clark County, Nevada, with Judge Joe Hardy presiding. Having reviewed the pleadings on file, this Court makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

///

FINDINGS OF FACT

1 1. Kelly Eppinger (hereinafter “the Petitioner”) worked for Respondent Linden and
2 Associates from May 2019 until January 2020.

3 2. The Petitioner was initially hired, and began working, as an employee at Linden
4 and Associates.

5 3. In October 2019, Linden and Associates demanded that the Petitioner agree to be
6 changed from an employee to an independent contractor.

7 4. The Petitioner did not want to be reclassified as an independent contractor;
8 therefore, she scheduled a meeting with Dr. Linden to further discuss this demand.

9 5. Before the Petitioner had an opportunity to meet with Dr. Linden, she was
10 reclassified as an independent contractor without her consent.

11 6. After learning of her reclassification, the Petitioner began searching for new
12 employment.

13 7. On November 26, 2019, the Petitioner secured an offer of employment at Summit
14 Mental Health, which paid more than her wage at Linden and Associates.

15 8. When the Petitioner ultimately met with Dr. Linden, she asked him if he would
16 match the higher rate of pay offered by Summit Mental Health. In response, Dr. Linden advised
17 the Petitioner to accept the job at Summit Mental Health because he was unable to match the
18 higher rate of pay.

19 9. On January 1, 2020, the Petitioner then left Linden and Associates to begin working
20 at Summit Mental Health. The Petitioner worked at Summit Mental Health until a COVID-19-
21 related business closure.

22 10. The Petitioner then applied for unemployment insurance benefits with Respondent
23 Employment Security Division (hereinafter “ESD”).

24 11. In an Adjudication dated June 30, 2020, ESD found the Petitioner ineligible to
receive unemployment insurance benefits because good cause for quitting had not been shown.

 12. The Petitioner then filed a timely appeal.

 13. At the Petitioner’s appeal hearing, she testified that Linden and Associates’
decision to reclassify her as an independent contractor was the catalyst for her search of new
employment, but that she ultimately left Linden and Associates because she offered a higher rate
of pay at Summit Mental Health, which Dr. Linden could not match.

1 14. During the appeals hearing, Counsel for the Petitioner attempted to admit earnings
2 statements and weekly payroll reports from Summit Mental Health, which would have proven the
3 higher rate of pay and substantiated the Petitioner’s timeline, as it relates to how she secured
employment at Summit Mental Health prior to leaving Linden and Associates.

4 15. The Appeals Referee refused to admit the evidence based on the reasoning that “the
5 documentation...does not substantiate the employment on or proximate to the separation date”
6 and “the check earning statements are over a month after the separation date.”

7 16. On October 15, 2020, the Appeals Referee determined that the Petitioner did not
8 have good cause to quit because she quit due to personal, non-compelling reasons and prior to
exhausting all reasonable alternatives available to her.

9 17. The Petitioner timely appealed the Appeals Referee’s decision to the Respondent
Board of Review.

10 18. On December 3, 2020, the Board of Review entered its decision, affirming the
11 decision of the Appeals Referee.

12 19. On December 11, 2020, the Petitioner initiated the instant case by filing a Petition
for Judicial Review.

13 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

14 1. NRS 612.530(1) specifically provides “within 11 days after the decision of the
15 Board of Review has become final, any party aggrieved thereby or the Administrator may secure
judicial review thereof by commencing an action in the district court of the county where the
16 employment which is the basis of the claim was performed for the review of the decision.”

17 2. As to factual issues, the District Court’s function is to review administrative
18 findings for arbitrariness, capriciousness, or lack of substantial evidence. *Employment Security*
Dept. v. Weber, 100 Nev. 121, 676 P.2d 1318 (1984).

19 3. Substantial evidence is that “quantity and quality of evidence which a reasonable
20 person could accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” *Employment Security Dept. v. Cline*,
109 Nev. 74, 847 P.2d 736 (1993); *Employment Security Dept. v. Hilton Hotels*, 102 Nev. 606,
21 608 n.1, 729 P.2d 497, 498 n.1 (1986) (citation omitted).

22 4. Under NRS 612.380, a person is ineligible for unemployment benefits if she
23 voluntarily leaves her job without good cause. While there is no statutory definition for “good
24 cause,” ESD has found good cause when a claimant can demonstrate reasons so urgent and

1 compelling that the claimant had no reasonable alternative to quitting, and that the claimant
2 exhausted reasonable recourses prior to leaving her job. *Flippen v. Nev. Empl. Sec. Div.*, 2014
3 Nev. Unpub. LEXIS 2173, at *3 (2-1 decision) (Hardesty, J., dissenting).

4 5. The Court reviewed all questions of law de novo and notes the Board of Review's
5 fact-based legal conclusions are entitled to deference.

6 6. Here, however, the Petitioner has met her burden of proof under any standard of
7 review showing that she was entitled to unemployment benefits.

8 7. The Appeal Referee's determination and subsequent Board of Review decision of
9 affirmation are arbitrary and capricious and not supported by substantial evidence because the
10 determination and decision could not have been reached on the facts of this case as contained in
11 the record.

12 8. Additionally, they ignore the ESD's own finding/precedent that the Petitioner
13 demonstrated good cause to quit.

14 9. The Court confines its review to the record on appeal.

15 10. There is substantial evidence in the record to support that the Petitioner voluntarily
16 quit her job with good cause.

17 11. The Petitioner had good cause to quit due to Linden and Associates' decision to
18 reclassify her employment status from an employee to an independent contractor, which was made
19 without her consent.

20 12. The Petitioner had good cause to quit because she secured a higher paying job at
21 Summit Mental Health prior to leaving Linden and Associates.

22 13. The Board of Review abused its discretion by upholding the Appeals Referee's
23 decision to find the Petitioner not credible, as it pertained to her testimony regarding how she
24 secured employment at Summit Mental Health prior to leaving Linden and Associates.

14. The Board of Review abused its discretion by upholding the Appeals Referee's
decision to not admit relevant earnings statements into the record that would have substantiated
the Petitioner's testimony that she secured a higher paying job at Summit Mental Health prior to
quitting Linden and Associates.

///

///

///

1 15. Thus, the decision of the Appeals Referee, and the affirmation by the Board of
2 Review was not supported by substantial evidence.

3 Accordingly, based upon the aforementioned Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law,
4 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that the Petitioner Kelly
Eppinger's Petition for Judicial Review filed on December 11, 2020 is granted; and

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that the Decision of the
6 Board of Review, Employment Security Division, Department of Employment, Training and
Rehabilitation is reversed.

7 Dated this _____ day of _____, 2021.

Dated this 29th day of June, 2021

8 
9

10 JOE HARDY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

11 Approved as to form and content:

5FA 90D A181 7CE9
Joe Hardy
District Court Judge

12 
13

14 _____
15 ELIZABETH S. CARMONA, ESQ.
16 Nevada State Bar No. 14687
NEVADA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.
17 530 South Sixth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
18 Telephone: (702) 386-0404, ext. 128
Facsimile: (702) 388-1641
19 ecarmona@nlslaw.net
Attorney for Petitioner

20
21 /s/ Troy C. Jordan _____

22 TROY C. JORDAN, ESQ.
23 Nevada State Bar No. 9073
State of Nevada, Department of
24 Employment, Training & Rehabilitation (DETR)

1 Employment Security Division (ESD)
2 500 East Third Street
3 Carson City, Nevada 89713
4 Telephone: (775) 684-3996
5 Facsimile: (775) 684-3992
6 *Attorney for DETR/ESD*



Mon 6/28/2021 8:30 AM

Troy Jordan <tjordan@detr.nv.gov>

RE: Proposed Order - Kelly Eppinger v. ESD

To  Elizabeth Carmona

You may affix my electronic signature

From: Elizabeth Carmona <ecarmona@nslaw.net>

Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 2:26 PM

To: Troy Jordan <tjordan@detr.nv.gov>

Subject: Proposed Order - Kelly Eppinger v. ESD

Good afternoon, Mr. Jordan.

Please see attached for my Proposed Order for case no. A-20-826310-P, Kelly Eppinger v. ESD.

If you approve of the Proposed Order, please provide my office with the authority to use your electronic signature. I would appreciate a response by Monday, June 28th at 5:00 p.m.

Thank you,

Elizabeth S. Carmona, Esq.

Senior Attorney

NEVADA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.

530 South 6th Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Telephone: (702) 386-0404 x 128

Fax: (702) 388-1641

ecarmona@nslaw.net



1 **CSERV**

2
3 DISTRICT COURT
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5
6 In the Matter of the Petition of
7 Kelly Eppinger
8

CASE NO: A-20-826310-P
DEPT. NO. Department 15

9 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

13 Service Date: 6/29/2021

14 Tiffani Silva

tmsilva@detr.nv.gov

15 Troy Jordan, Esq.

ESDLegal@detr.nv.gov

16 Elizabeth Carmona, Esq.

ecarmona@nlslaw.net