IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

INDICATE FULL CAPTION:

EPLICA CORPORATE SERVICES; AND BROADSPIRE SERVICES, Appellants,

 V_{\bullet}

JOY LANGLEY, Respondent:

No.	83563	Electronically Filed Oct 13 2021 03:25 p.m.
	DO	CKETING STATE OF SUPREME COURT

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 21
County Clark	Judge Tara Clark Newberry
District Ct. Case No. A-20-819422-J	
2. Attorney filing this docketing statemen	t:
Attorney Daniel L. Schwartz, Esq.	Telephone <u>702-893-3383</u>
Firm Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith	
Address 2300 W. Sahara Ave. Ste. 900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102	
Client(s) Eplica Corporate Services and Broads	spire Services
If this is a joint statement by multiple appellants, add the names of their clients on an additional sheet accomplishing of this statement.	ne names and addresses of other counsel and anied by a certification that they concur in the
3. Attorney(s) representing respondents(s)):.
Attorney Lina Sakalauskas, Esq.	Telephone (702) 486-2830
Firm Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers	
Address 2200 S Rancho Dr. Ste 230 Las Vegas. Nevada 89102	
Chianton Tor Laidalas.	
Client(s) Joy Langley	
Attorney	Telephone
Firm	
Address	
Chent(s)	

(List additional counsel on separate sheet if necessary)

4. Nature of disposition below (check	all that apply):		
☐ Judgment after bench trial	☐ Dismissal:		
☐ Judgment after jury verdict	☐ Lack of jurisdiction		
Summary judgment	☐ Failure to state a claim		
☐ Default judgment	☐ Failure to prosecute		
☐ Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief	Other (specify):		
☐ Grant/Denial of injunction	☐ Divorce Decree:		
☐ Grant/Denial of declaratory relief	☐ Original ☐ Modification		
□ Review of agency determination	☑ Other disposition (specify): Workers comp		
5. Does this appeal raise issues concer	rning any of the following?		
☐ Child Custody ☐ Venue ☐ Termination of parental rights 6. Pending and prior proceedings in t of all appeals or original proceedings prese are related to this appeal: None	his court. List the case name and docket number ently or previously pending before this court which		
court of all pending and prior proceedings	ther courts. List the case name, number and in other courts which are related to this appeal d proceedings) and their dates of disposition:		

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

This is a workers' compensation case. On June 7, 2018, Respondent JOY LANGLEY (hereinafter "Claimant"), a bus ambassador from a temporary staffing agency, alleges that while climbing the steps of a bus, her right foot slipped, causing injury. Throughout the course of the case, Claimant never indicated that there was any defect with the steps or that the work environment otherwise caused her accident/injury. Administrator denied the claim. Claimant appealed.

On July 28, 2020, the Appeals Officer held that Claimant had established a compensable claim despite the lack of any workplace involvement. It is also noteworthy that the Appeals Officer did not apply the "increased risk" test despite the fact that this fall was unexplained and involved stairs.

Petitioners filed the subject Petition for Judicial Review, contesting the Appeals Officer's July 28, 2020 Decision. The District Court granted a stay thereof.

On August 26, 2021, the District Court affirmed the Appeals Officer. Notice of Entry of Order was filed on August 30, 2021.

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

Whether the Appeals Officer's Decision and Order was based upon substantial evidence as required by NRS 233B.125.

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 matter is presumptively retained by the Supreme Court		
14. Trial. If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last?		
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 Aug 26, 2021
	If no written judg seeking appellate	ment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for review:
17	. Date written no	tice of entry of judgment or order was served Aug 30, 2021
	Was service by: ☐ Delivery	
	⊠ Mail/electroni	c/fax
	. If the time for fi RCP 50(b), 52(b),	ling the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion or 59)
	(a) Specify the the date of f	type of motion, the date and method of service of the motion, and illing.
	□ NRCP 50(b)	Date of filing
	□ NRCP 52(b)	Date of filing
	□ NRCP 59	Date of filing
Ń	OTE: Motions made time for filing P.3d 1190 (2016	pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration may toll the a notice of appeal. See AA Primo Builders v. Washington, 126 Nev, 245
	(b) Date of entr	y of written order resolving tolling motion
	(c) Date writter	n notice of entry of order resolving tolling motion was served
	Was service	by:
	□ Delivery □ Maíl	
	TT TATEGET	

19. Date notice of appeal filed 09/23/2021		
-	y has appealed from the judgment or order, list the date each iled and identify by name the party filing the notice of appeal:	
DO Russiki statut	le governing the time limit for filing the notice of appeal,	
e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other		
e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other NRAP 4(a)		
e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other NRAP 4(a)	SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY	
e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other NRAP 4(a)	SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY r other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review	
e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other NRAP 4(a) 21. Specify the statute o the judgment or order a	SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY r other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review ppealed from:	
e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other NRAP 4(a) 21. Specify the statute o the judgment or order a (a)	SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY r other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review ppealed from:	
e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other NRAP 4(a) 21. Specify the statute o the judgment or order a (a) NRAP 3A(b)(1)	SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY r other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review ppealed from: \[\sum \text{NRS 38.205} \] \[\text{NRS 233B.150}	

This is a Petition for Judicial Review of a workers' compensation Appeals Officer. Appellants filed their Petition with the District Court pursuant to NRS 233B.130. The District Court denied Appellants' Petition. As this final judgment of the District Court aggrieved Appellants, this Court has jurisdiction to hear this appeal under NRS 233B.150.

22. List all parties involved in the action or consolidated actions in the district court: (a) Parties: EPLICA CORPORATE SERVICES and BROADSPIRE SPERVICES, Appellants,
JOY LANGLEY and THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS DIVISION, APPEALS OFFICE, Respondents
(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 Department of Administration did not participate in the District Court Petition.
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. EPLICA CORPORATE SERVICES and BROADSPIRE SERVICES. Petition for Judicial Review JOY LANGLEY - None THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS DIVISION, APPEALS OFFICE - None 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 No 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
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.

Eplica Corporate Services, Broadspire Name of appellant 10[13 2] Date	Daniel L. Schwartz, Esq. Name of counsel of record Signature of counsel of record
Clark County, Nevada State and county where signed	
CERTIFICA	ATE OF SERVICE
completed docketing statement upon all cou ☐ By personally serving it upon him/h ☒ By mailing it by first class mail with	er; or a sufficient postage prepaid to the following d addresses cannot fit below, please list names with the addresses.)
Dated this day of	Stephanie Signature

Electronically Filed 8/30/2021 10:49 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

NEOJ Lina S. Sakalauskas, Esq., Deputy Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers Nevada State Bar No. Bar No. 007893 2200 South Rancho Drive, Suite 230 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 | ">lephone: (702) 486-2830 Facsimile: (702) 486-2844 Email: sakalauskas@naiw.nv.gov Attorney for Respondent JOY LANGLEY ς DISTRICT COURT 7 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 SPLICA CORPORATE SERVICES and BROADSPIRE SERVICES 10 Petitioner. 11 CASE NO. A-20-819422-J ∇ , 12 DEPT NO. 21 ! ICY LANGIEY and THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS DIVISION, APPEALS OFFICER, an Agency of the State of Nevada, 15 Respondents. 16 17 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW 18 TO: EPLICA CORPORATE SERVICES; **70:** 20 BROADSPIRE SERVICES; and 21 DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ., their counsel: 22 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an 23 ORDER DENVING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW in the above-entitled matter was entered herein on the 26th day of August, 2021, a true 25 26 27 28

Republic Dinner S VIV Reinig

New York

and correct copy of which is attached hereto.

DATED this 30 day of August, 2021.

Respectfully submitted:

Lina S. Sakalauskas, Esq., Deputy Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers Nevada State Bar No. 007893 2200 S. Rancho Drive, Suite 230 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 (702) 486-2830

Attorney for Respondent JOY LANGLEY

ELECTRONICALLY SERVED 8/26/2021 5:51 PM

Electronically Filed 08/26/2021 5:51 PM CLERK OF THE COURT

Lina S. Sakalauskas, Esq., Deputy Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers Nevada State Bar No. Bar No. 007893 2200 South Rancho Drive, Suite 230 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 4 | Telephone: (702) 486-2830 Facsimile: (702) 486-2844 Email: sakalauskas@naiw.nv.gov Actorney for Respondent JOY LANGLEY 6 DISTRICT COURT 7 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA Ü EPLICA CORPORATE SERVICES and BROADSPIRE SERVICES 10 Petitioner. î î CASE NO. A-20-819422-J DEPT NO. 21 12 13 JOY LANGLEY and THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS 14 DIVISION, APPEALS OFFICER, an Agency of the State of Nevada, 15 Respondents. 16 17 DECISION AND ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW 18 12 This matter involves a contested workers' compensation 20 claim. 21 1 Respondent, JOY LANGLEY, filed a claim for compensation for 22 s date of injury of June 7, 2018. 23. Petitioner Administrator, BROADSPIRE SERVICES, issued a 24 claim denial determination on July 6, 2018. Respondent Langley disagreed with the denial of her claim 26 g and the matter was litigated resulting in the reversal of the 27 claim denial by the Decision and Order of Appeals Officer Gary A.

Case Minimiser & ad aspisar (

28 Pulliam, Esq. filed July 28, 2020.

The appeals officer found that Respondent Langley had met her burden of proof to show by a preponderance of the evidence that she suffered a work-related accident resulting in injury and ordered the claim accepted as an industrial claim.

This matter came on for hearing (via Blue Jeans) on August 12, 2021 on Petitioners' Petition for Judicial Review.

Petitioners' Petition for Judicial Review was duly reviewed and considered for decision and the Court, having reviewed the 9 parties' briefs, the Record on Appeal, and oral arguments of 10 counsel, finds pursuant to NRS 233B.135 that the July 28, 2020 il Becision and Order of Appeals Officer Pulliam is supported by 12 substantial evidence in the administrative record, is devoid of any errors of law, was not erroneous, arbitrary or capricious, 14 and was not in violation of applicable statutory and regulatory 15 provisions or in excess of the authority of the appeals officer.

The Court concludes that the appeals officer did not commit la any factual errors in finding an accepted industrial claim. is Court further concludes that the appeals officer did not err as a laymenter of law in his spalysis of Rio All Suite Hotel and Casino 20 V. Phillips, 240 P.3d 2 (2010). The appeals officer did analyze 21 Pobls matter under Phillips and distinguished the case as 22 enumerated in his Conclusions of Law paragraphs seven (7) through 13 fourteen (14) in his Decision and Order.

It is therefore ONDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the 25 appeals officer's July 28, 2020 Decision and Order is hereby 25 AFFIRMED, and the Petition for Judicial Review is hereby DENIED 37 and dismissed with prejudice.

25 (. . .

à

5

7

16 |

The matter is hereby REMANDED to Petitioners to accept the claim and provide Respondent Langley appropriate benefits 2 | pursuant to NRS 616A-616D and NRS 617. Dated this day of August, 2021. Dated this 26th day of August, 2021 Submitted by: 1D9 686 16A6 FF7D **Tara Clark Newberry** District Court Judge Mina S. Sakalayakas, Esq - Deputy Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers Nevada State Bar No.: 007893 2200 S. Rancho Drive, Suite 230 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 (702) 486-2830 Attorney for Respondent JOY LANGLEY

9

G

7

Ü

3.0

14

15

1.6

1.7

18

15

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3

CSERV

-

.3

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Eplica Corporate Services, Inc.,

CASE NO: A-20-819422-J

Petitioner(s)

DEPT. NO. Department 21

vs,

Joy Langley, Respondent(s)

10 11

12

13

14

15

17

12

20

21

8

9

AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

Service Date: 8/26/2021

Joel Reeves

joel.reeves@lewisbrisbois.com

16 Stephanie Jensen

stephanic.jensen@lewisbrisbois.com

Lina Sakalauskas

sakalauskas@naiw.nv.gov

19 Natasha Andrews

n.andrews@naiw.nv.gov

Evan Beavers

cbcavers@naiw.nv.gov

Nancy Sherwood

nsherwood@naiw.nv.gov

22 Mary Russell

mrussell@naiw.nv.gov

23

Daniel Schwartz

daniel.schwartz@lewisbrisbois.com

24

25

26

27

28

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the State of Nevada, Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers, and that service of the within and foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW was made this day electronically, through the Odyssey eFileNV and Serve option to:

> DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESO. daniel, schwartz@lewisbrisbois.com

JOEL P. REEVES, ESQ. Joel.Reeves@lewisbrisbois.com

10

12

13 #

14

15

7

8

9

2

and that on this day I deposited a true and correct copy for mailing at Las Vegas, Nevada, OR placed in the appropriate addressee file maintained by the Department of Administration, 2200 S. Rancho Drive, #220, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 to the following:

3.8

17

3.8

19

20

23:

22

23

24

25

26

2.

23

DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. LEWIS, BRISBOIS, ET AL, 2300 W SAHARA AVE STE 300 BOX 28 DAS VEGAS, NV 89102

2010 South Barreto Brive Suive 36 Low Wigner, NV 8910? Corner Cay, NV 1988