IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Margaret Reddy, Mohan Thalamarla, Max Global, INC.

Supreme Court No. 83763

Appellants,

VS.

MEDAPPEAL, LLC, an Illinois limited liability company

Respondent.

Electronically Filed Dec 21 2021 09:29 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

APPELLANT'S DOCKETING STATEMENT, CIVIL APPEALS

The Wasielewski Law Firm, LTD.

Andrew Wasielewski, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 6161
Andrew Pastwick, Esq.
Nevada Bar. No. 9146
8275 South Eastern Avenue, Suite 200-818
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Telephone: (702) 490-8511
Fascimile: (702) 548-9684
andrew@wazlaw.com

Attorneys for Appellants:

Margaret Reddy, Mohan Thalamarla and Max Global, INC.

GENERAL INFORMATION

All appellants not in proper person must complete this docketing statement. NRAP 14(a). The purpose of the docketing statement is to assist the Supreme Court in screening jurisdiction, classifying cases for en bane, panel, or expedited treatment, compiling statistical information and identifying parties and their counsel.

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 attach requested documents, 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.

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 | 8 | Depa | irtment | XIV | | County | CLARK . |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| | Judge _ | ADRIANA I | ESCOBAR | | District Ct. | Docket | No | A-19-792836-C | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Attorney filing this docketing statement: | | | | | | | | |
| | Attorney ANDREW PASTWICK, ESQ. for ANDREW WASIELEWSKI, ESQ. Telephone (702) 490-8511 . | | | | | | | | |
| | Firm THE WASIELEWSKI LAW FIRM, LTD. | | | | | | | | |
| | Address 8275 S. EASTERN AVENUE, SUITE 200-818, LAS VEGAS, NV 89101 | | | | | | | | |
| | Client MARGARET REDDY, MOHAN THALAMARLA, MAX GLOBAL, INC | | | | | | | | |
| | | clients on an a | | | | | | resses of other cou at they concur in t | insel and the names the filing of this |
| 3. | Attorn | ey(s) represe | enting resp | ondent(s): | | | | | |
| | Attorney | ZACHARY B | ALL, ESQ. | | | Te | lephon | e (702) 303-8600 | |
| | Firm TH | E BALL LAW | GROUP | | | | | | |
| | Address 1935 Village Center Circle, #120, Las Vegas, NV 89134 | | | | | | | | |
| | Client(s) | MEDAPPEAL | L, LLC (an l | Illinois limit | ed liability co | ompany). | | | |
| | Attorney JAY FREEDMAN, ESQ | | | | Telephone (702) 342-5425 | | | | |
| | Firm | | | | | | | | |
| | Address | 11700 W. CHAI | RLESTON BI | LVD., SUITE | 170-357, LAS V | /EGAS, N | V 89135 | | |
| | Client(s) | MEDAPPEAL, | , LLC (an Illir | nois limited lia | bility company) |) | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | | of disposition | · | check all t | hat apply): | | | | |
| | Judg Sumi Defa Dism L F | ment after ben ment after jury mary judgment ult judgment hissal ack of jurisdic ailure to state ailure to prosether (Directed | y verdict t ction a claim | otion) | | | Grant Grant Revie Divor | t/Denial of NRCP (t/Denial of injuncti t/Denial of declarate w of agency determined decree: Original Mo r disposition | on ory relief |
| 5. | Does th | is appeal rai | ise issues (| concerning | any of the | followin | g: | | |
| N/ | A | | | | | | | | |
| | ☐ Child☐ Venue☐ Adop | e | Į | | ion of parenta nial of injunct matters | | KO | | |

- 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: APPEAL NUMBER 83253 IS PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT WITH SAME CAPTION
- 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:

NONE

8. Nature of the action. Briefly describe the nature of the action, including a list of the causes of action pleaded, and the result below:

RESPONDENT FILED ITS COMPLAINT AND THEN AMENDED ITS COMPLAINT AGAINST VARIOUS DEFENDANTS INCLUDING APPELLANTS FOR VARIOUS INTENTIONAL CAUSES OF ACTION.

THESE APPELLANTS MOVED TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT AGAINST THEM, ALLEGING IN DECLARATIONS THAT RESPONDENT HAD NO JURISDICTION OVER THEM PERSONALLY AND INDIVIDUALLY. APPELLANTS ALLEGE THAT MOTION WAS IMPROPERLY DENIED.

LATER, A MOTION TO COMPEL WAS FILED AGAINST DEFENDANT MARGARET REDDY. THE ISSUE WAS BRIEFED AND THE DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER ENTERED A DCRR THAT ESSENTIALLY GRANTED THE MOTION. DEFENDANT MARGARET TIMELY OBJECTED AND THE OBJECTION WAS SET FOR HEARING. IT DOES NOT APPEAR THE OBJECTION WAS EVER HEARD, NOR WAS IT PROPERLY RULED UPON, THROUGH INFORMATION AND BELIEF AFTER REVIEWING THE REGISTRY OF ACTIONS IN THIS MATTER.

RESPONDENT FILED FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT. THE COURT GRANTED SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND ENTERED JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF RESPONDENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$225,000.00.

PETITIONER PREVIOUSLY APPEALED THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST THESE APPELLANTS. RESPONDENT FILED A MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES. THE COURT DID NOT INDEPENDENTLY RULE ON THE MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES, DIRECTING ALL PARTIES AT THE HEARING GRANTING THE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT WHEREIN THE ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS WERE GRANTED. APPELLANTS WERE FOUND BY THE DISTRICT COURT TO BE JOINTLY AND SEVERALLY LIABLE FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS AS WELL. APPELLANTS MOVED FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT CITING THAT RESPONDENT IS NOT LICENSED TO DO BUSINESS IN NEVADA AND IS A FOREIGN LLC. APPELLANTS' MOTION WAS DENIED IN A CHAMBERS RULING, DESPITE HAVING NOTICED A HEARING ON THE MOTION.

Issues on appeal. State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal:

APPELLANT ASSERTS THERE IS NO JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AS

| | AS NO FACTS SUPPORTING A CONCLUSION OF LAW APPELLANT IS A JOINT TORT FEASOR(S). |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9. | Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues. If you are aware of any proceeding presently pending before this court which raises the same or similar issues raised in this appeal, list the <i>case</i> name and docket number and identify the same or similar issues raised: |
| | NONE KNOWN. |
| 10. | 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 |
| 11. | Other issues. Does this appeal involve any of the following issues? Reversal of well-settled Nevada precedent to an attachment, identify the case(s)) An issue arising under the United States and/or 4 Nevada Constitutions |

| | ☑ A substantial issue of first-impression☑ An issue of public policy |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | □ An issue where en hanc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of this court's decisions □ A ballot question |
| | If so, explain: APPELLANT BRINGS BEFORE THIS SUPREME COURT AN ISSUE WHETHER CITIZENS OF MICHIGAN AND INDIA CAN BE JOINTLY AND SEVERALLY LIABLE IN NEVADA FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES BY A FOREIGN COMPANY, WITHOUT HAVING ANY CONTACT WITH RESPONDENT, WITH HAVING NO CONTACTS IN NEVADA AND WITHOUT RESPONDENT FILING TO DO BUSINESS IN NEVADA AND WITH RESPONDENT ADMITTING IT NEVER DID BUSINESS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA |
| 13. | Trial. If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last? N/A |
| | Was it a bench or jury trial? BENCH / SUMMARY JUDGMENT |
| 14. | Judicial disqualification. Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from |
| | participation in this appeal. If so. which Justice? NO |
| | TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL |
| 15. | Date of entry of written judgment or order appealed from 10/6/2021 and 10/27/21 Attach a copy. If more than one judgment or order is appealed from, attach copies of each judgment or order from which an appeal is taken. |
| | (a) If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review: |
| 16. | Date written notice of entry of judgment or order served $\underline{10/6/2021}$ and $\underline{10/27/21}$. Attach a copy, including proof of service, for each order or judgment appealed from. |
| | (a) Was service by ELECTRONIC delivery \square or by mail \square (specify). |
| 17. | If the time for filing the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion (NRCP 50(h), 52(h), or 59), |
| | (a) Specify the type of motion. and the date and method of service of the motion, and date of filing, N/A |
| NR | CP 50(b) |
| | NOTE: Motions made pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration do not toil the time for filing a notice of appeal. |
| | (b) Date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion |
| | (c) Date written notice of entry of order resolving motion served |
| | (i) Was service by deliveryor by mail(specify). |
| 18. | Date notice of appeal was filed November 5, 2021 . |
| | (a) If more than one party has appealed from the judgment or order, list date each notice of appeal was filed and identify by name the party filing the notice of appeal: N/A |
| 19. | Specify statute or rule governing the time limit fur filing the notice of appeal, e.g., NRAP 4(a), NRS 155.190, or other NRAP 4(a) |

SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY

| appealed from: | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| NRAP 3A(b)(1) | |
| NRAP 3A(b)(2) | |
| NRAP 3A(b)(3) Other (specify) | |
| Explain how each authority provides a basis for appeal from the judgment or order: | |
| RULE USED ALLOWS AN APPEAL FROM THE FINAL ORDER. | |
| COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SECTION ONLY IF MORE THAN ONE CLAIM FOR RELIEF WAS PRESENT IN THE ACTION (WHETHER AS A CLAIM, COUNTERCLAIM, CROSS-CLAIM, OR THIRD-PARTY CLAIR OR IF MULTIPLE PARTIES WERE INVOLVED IN THE ACTION. Attach separate sheets as necessary. | |
| 21. List all parties involved in the action in the district court: | |
| MEDAPPEAL LLC – PLAINTIFF, COUNTERDEFENDANT | |
| VIJAY REDDY - DEFENDANT MARGARET REDDY – DEFENDANT | |
| MOHAN THALAMARLA – DEFENDANT | |
| MAX GLOBAL INC – DEFENDANT | |
| DAVID WEINSTEIN – DEFENDANT MEDASSET INC – DEFENDANT, COUNTERCLAIMANT, THIRD PARTY PLAINTIFF | |
| KEVIN BROWN – DEFENDANT | |
| VISIONARY BUSINESS BROKERS – DEFENDANT LIBERTY CONSULTING & MANAGEMENT SERVICES, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT | |
| EIDERTT CONSCETING & MAINTOLINENT SERVICES, THIRD TARTT BEILENDANT | |
| (a) 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 UNDERSIGNED ONLY REPRESENTS THE APPELLANTS. | |
| 22. Give a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate claims, counterclaims, cross-claims third-party claims, and the trial court's disposition of each claim, and how each claim was resolved (i order, judgment, stipulation), and the date of disposition of each claim. Attach a copy of each disposition. | |
| MEDAPPEAL – FILED COMPLAINT AND AMENDED COMPLAINT, SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON AMENDED COMPLAINT | |
| MEDASSET – FILED COUNTERCLAIM AND THIRD PARTY COMPLAINT AT HEARING, COURT ORDERED ALL CLAIMS DISPOSED OF. | |
| 23. Attach copies of the last-filed version of all complaints, counterclaims, and/or cross-claims filed in the district court. | |
| 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 below: | |
| Yes ☑ No □ | |

| If you answered "No" to the immediately previous question, 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 or NRCP 54(b): | der appealed from as a final judgment pursuant to | | | | | |
| Yes ☑ No ☐ If "Yes," attach a copy of the cert entry and proof of service. | ification or order, including any notice of | | | | | |
| (d) Did the district court make an express determin reason for delay and an express direction for the entry of | ation, pursuant to NRCP 54(b). that there is no just f judgment: | | | | | |
| Yes □ No □ | | | | | | |
| 26. If you answered "No" to any part of question 25, explai is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)): | n the basis for seeking appellate review (e.g., order | | | | | |
| VERIFICA | TION | | | | | |
| I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read provided in this docketing statement is true and comple belief, and that I have attached all required documents t | te to the best of my knowledge, information and | | | | | |
| Margaret Reddy, Mohan Thalamarla, Max Global, Inc NAME OF APPELLANTS | ANDREW WASIELEWSKI, ESQ. NAME OF COUNSEL OF RECORD | | | | | |
| DECEMBER 21, 2021 | /S/ ANDREW PASTWICK, ESQ FOR | | | | | |
| DATE | SIGNATURE OF COUNSEL OF RECORD | | | | | |
| NEVADA, CLARK COUNTY | | | | | | |
| STATE AND COUNTY WHERE SIGNED | | | | | | |

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

| I certify that on theday ofDecember, 2021 _ I served a copy of this completed docketing statement upon all counsel of record: |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ☐ By personally serving it upon him/her: or |
| ☑ By electronically serving the document utilizing the e-service provisions of the Nevada Supreme Court E-Flex System to the following address(es): |
| Court L-1 lex System to the following address(es). |
| ZACHARTY T. BALL, ESQ. THE BALL LAW GROUP |
| Attorneys for Respondent |
| STEPHEN HABERFELD, settlement judge |
| |
| Dated this 21st day of December, 2021 |
| /s/ ANDREW PASTWICK, FOR ANDREW WASIELEWSKI |
| Signature of Employee |