

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

RHONDA ROE, DENISE DOE, JANE  
DOE DANCER, AND JANE DOE  
DANCERS 2-7,

Appellants,  
vs.

JACQUELINE FRANKLIN, ASHLEIGH  
PARK, LILY SHEPARD, STACIE  
ALLEN, MICHAELA DEVINE,  
SAMANTHA JONES, KARINA  
STRELKOVA, DANIELLE LAMAR  
individually, and on behalf of Class of  
similarly situated individuals, and  
RUSSELL ROAD FOOD AND  
BEVERAGE, LLC, a Nevada limited  
liability company (d/b/a CRAZY HORSE  
III GENTLEMEN'S CLUB) SN  
INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC, a  
Nevada limited liability company (d/b/a  
CRAZY HORSE III GENTLEMEN'S  
CLUB), DOE CLUB OWNER, I-X, DOE  
EMPLOYER, I-X, ROE CLUB OWNER, I-  
X, and ROE EMPLOYER, IX,  
RUSSELL ROAD FOOD AND  
BEVERAGE, LLC,

Respondents.

Case No. 84004

**RESPONSE TO DOCKETING  
STATEMENT**

Electronically Filed  
Jan 31 2022 06:03 p.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

Respondent, Russell Road Food and Beverage, LLC (“Russell Road”) hereby submits its Response to Appellants’ Docketing Statement filed on January 24, 2022. Appellants identify two issues on appeal in Section 9, as items 4 and 5. However, Appellants have no standing for the Supreme Court to consider these two issues. Specifically, Appellants have set forth they are seeking a finding that the District Court erred in granting summary judgment and denying class action which occurred in 2017. Appellants are also improperly seeking a finding from this Court that the District Court erred granting the dismissal of individuals based on subject matter jurisdiction prior to an NRCP change regarding aggregation of damages. However, Appellants neglect to identify the fact that they were never parties to any of these motions and therefore cannot appeal the 2017 rulings as they lack any standing. Summary Judgment was granted as to a single individual, and the other dismissals pertained to individual named Plaintiffs, and none of those individuals are the current “Doe” or “Roe” Appellants. The previous appeal on those issues was dismissed in an order filed by the Nevada Supreme Court on February 28, 2020. That order states that “in the event the district court declines to grant the requested relief, appellant may file a motion to reinstate the appeal.” Here, the relief requested was granted by the District Court, and the original appellants have not filed any motion to reinstate their appeal, therefore this Court cannot consider those issues, and Appellants should not be permitted to seek their review. In addition, current “Doe” and “Roe” Appellants, have not been granted leave to proceed anonymously, and as it is impossible for the Court to evaluate any potential conflicts.

DATED this 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2022.

/s/ Jeffery A. Bendavid,  
JEFFERY A. BENDAVID, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 6220)  
**BENDAVID LAW**  
7301 Peak Dr., Suite 150  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89128  
702-385-6114