**Electronically Filed** 1/3/2022 4:15 PM Steven D. Grierson **CLERK OF THE COURT** 

1 **NOAS** DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 005125 L. MICHAEL FRIEND, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 011131 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP 2300 W. Sahara Ave. Ste. 900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 5 Telephone: 702-893-3383 Facsimile: 702-366-9689 Email: daniel.schwartz@lewisbrisbois.com Attorneys for Appellants Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and Cannon Cochran Management Services, Inc. (CCMSI) 8 9 10 DISTRICT COURT **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 11 12 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT and CCMSI, 13 Appellants, 14 v. 15 WILLIAM FERGUSON,

Electronically Filed Jan 10 2022 08:57 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

CASE NO: A-21-830966-J DEPT. NO.: XXVIII

16

17 Respondent.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

# NOTICE OF APPEAL

TO: WILLIAM FERGUSON, Respondent

TO: LISA ANDERSON, ESQ., of GGRM, Respondent's Attorney

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Appellants, LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE

DEPARTMENT and CCMSI (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellants"), by and through their

attorneys, DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ., and L. MICHAEL FRIEND, ESQ. of LEWIS,

25 BRISBOIS, BISGAARD & SMITH, LLP, in the above-entitled action, hereby appeal to the

Supreme Court of the State of Nevada from the attached "Order" entered in this action on or about

4861-1928-8840.1 / 33307-462

December 16, 2021, which granted Petitioners' Petition for Judicial Review and the "Notice of Entry of Order" filed on or about December 17, 2021. DATED this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of January, 2022. Respectfully submitted, LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP By: /s/ L. Michael Friend, Esq. DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 005125 L. MICHAEL FRIEND, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 011131 2300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Phone: 702-893-3383 Fax: 702-366-9563 Attorneys for Appellants Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department And CCMSI 

# 1 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** Pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 5(b), I hereby certify that, on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of 2 3 January, 2022, service of the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL was made this date by depositing 4 a true copy of the same for mailing, first class mail, as follows: 5 LISA M. ANDERSON **GGRM** 2770 S. MARYLAND PKWY SUITE 100 LAS VEGAS, NV 89109 8 LVMPD- HEALTH DETAIL 9 ATTN: BERNADINE WELSH 400 S. MARTIN LUTHER KING BLVD. BUILDING B LAS VEGAS, NV 89106 10 11 **CCMSI** ATTN: GABRIELA DIAZ P.O. BOX 35350 12 LAS VEGAS, NV 89133 13 14 /s/ Stephanie Jensen 15 An employee of LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

Electronically Filed
12/17/2021 8:06 AM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

**NEOJ** 

LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ. 2 Nevada Bar No. 4907 3 GGRM LAW FIRM 2270 South Maryland Parkway, #100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89109 Phone: 702. 384.1616 ~ Fax: 702.384.2990 Email: landerson@ggrmlawfirm.com 6 Attorneys for Petitioner 7 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 WILLIAM FERGUSON, 9 Petitioner, 10 11 VS. CASE NO.: A-21-830966-J DEPT. NO.: XXVIII 12 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, CCMSI and THE 13 DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION. HEARINGS DIVISION. 14 15 Respondents. 16

# NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

TO: All parties of interest.

YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an Order was entered in the above-entitled matter on the 6th day of December, 2021, a copy of which is attached.

DATED this 6 day of December, 2021.

**GGRM LAW FIRM** 

LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 4907

2770 South Maryland Parkway, #100

Las Vegas, Nevada 89109 Attorneys for Petitioner

Case Number: A-21-830966-J

.24

.25

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of GGRM LAW FIRM, and that on the day of December, 2021, I caused the foregoing document entitled NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER to be served upon those persons designated by parties in the E-Service Master List for the above-referenced matter in the Eighth Judicial District Court eFiling System in accordance with the mandatory electronic service requirements of Administrative Order 14-2 and the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules and depositing a true and correct copy in a sealed envelope, postage fully prepaid, addressed as follows:

Daniel L. Schwartz, Esq. LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH 2300 West Sahara Avenue Suite 900 Box 28 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

An Employee of the GGRM LAW FIRM

# **ELECTRONICALLY SERVED** 12/16/2021 10:43 AM

Electronically Filed 12/16/2021 10:42 AN CLERK OF THE COURT

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

	<u> </u>		
ţ	ORDG		
2	LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 004907		
3:	GGRM LAW FIRM		
_	2770 South Maryland Parkway Suite 100		
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89109		
5	Phone: (702) 384-1616		
6	Facsimile: (702) 384-2990		
7	Email: landerson@ggmlawfim.com Attorneys for Petitioner		
8	Die	TRICT COURT	
9	DIS	IRICI:COORT	
	CLARK (	COUNTY, NEVAD	<b>A</b> ·
10	WILLIAM FERGUSON,	)	
11		j	
12	Petitioner	)	
13	vs.	) CASE NO. :	A-21-830966-J
14		) DEPT. NO. :	IIIVXX
15	LAS VEGAS METROPOLLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, CCMSI, and THE	JE). )	
	DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION	τ, ΄)	
16	HEARINGS DIVISION,	Ď	
17	Respondents.	)	
18	*		
19	ORDER GRANTING PE	arii aorinom	ICIAL REVIEW

# ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

This matter came before this Court on the Petition for Judicial Review filed by the Petitioner, WILLIAM FERGUSON. Petitioner was represented by LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ. of the GGRM LAW FIRM. Respondents, LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT and CCMSI, were represented by DANIAL L. SCHWARTZ. ESQ. of the law firm LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH. No other parties were present or represented. After reviewing the record and considering the briefs, this matter is decided as follows:

Con- Mirmham A 04; 900000.1

б

This matter came before this Court on November 18, 2021 for hearing on the March 11, 2021 Petition for Judicial Review. The Court has reviewed the August 6, 2021 Petitioner's Opening Brief, the September 8, 2021 Respondent's Answering Brief, and the October 8, 2021 Petitioner's Reply Brief, and the entirety of the record, including the June 25, 2021 Transmittal of Record on Appeal, which contains the Record on Appeal, and hereby FINDS that pursuant to NRS 233B.135, the Appeals Officer's February 18, 2021 Decision and Order is arbitrary and capricious and not supported by substantial evidence in the Record on Appeal.

Judicial review of a final decision of an agency is governed by NRS 233B.155. An agency's factual determinations may be disturbed on appeal if they are arbitrary and capricious due to the lack of substantial evidence. Barrick Goldstrike Mine v. Peterson, 116 Nev. 541, 547, 2 P.3d 850, 854 (2000). On the other hand, an agency's legal determination is reviewed de novo. SIIS v. Khweiss, 108 Nev. 123, 126, 825 P.2d 218, 220 (1992). Here, both factual and legal determinations are at issue as to whether Petitioner satisfied the legal requirements of NRS 617.457 to qualify for the conclusive presumption to claim compensation for his alleged occupationally related heart disease. The Court will address each issue in turn.

First, the Appeals Officer made an error of law when applying the burden of proof of NRS 617.457. The opposing party, not the claimant, has the burden to meet the requirements under NRS 617.457(11) to disqualify a claimant from received compensatory benefits. See Manwill v. Clark County, 123 Nev. 238, 243-44, 162 P.3d 876, 880 (2007). Applying here, Respondents had the burden to prove that Petitioner did not take corrective action to lower his weight, triglycerides, and cholesterol. As such, the Appeals Officer erred in shifting this burden to Petitioner.

ttI

28:

HI

INTERPRETATIONS

The Manwill Court held that a claimant has no burden to disprove the failure to correct predisposing conditions did not lead to a claimant's heart disease under NRS 617.457(11), or that no predisposing conditions exist, to receive the benefits under NRS 617.457, See, 123 Nev. 238, 242-44 (2007). The predisposing conditions section under NRS 617.457 has existed since 1973. NRS 617.457(11); see, 1973 Nev. Stat. ch. 504, § 1, at 769. In 1989, the Nevada legislature set the current conclusive presumption found in NRS 617.457(1). 1989 Nev. Stat. ch. 480, § 2, at 1021. Since that time, the Nevada legislature has only expanded the ability for claims under NRS 617.457 to be accepted. Compare NRS 617.457(1989) with NRS 617.457(2017); see also, Manwill, 123 Nev. 238; Gallagher v. City of Las Vegas, 114 Nev. 595, 601, 959 P.2d 519, 522 (1998).

The Manwill Court knew the existence of, and failure to correct, predisposing conditions would exclude a claimant from benefits under NRS 617.457. Manwill, 123 Nev. 238, 242-43. However, the Court found a claimant has absolutely no burden to show they do not have any predisposition conditions and/or had the ability to correct them but failed to do so. See, Id. at 244. If such a burden and requirement existed, then the Nevada Supreme Court would have listed it as such, but instead merely requires a claimant to "show only two things: heart disease and five years' qualifying employment before disablement." Id. at 242-44. The claimant in Manwill did not have to show the correction of a predisposing condition within their ability to correct nor did he have to show no predisposing conditions existed. Id.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14 15

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25 26

27

28

As such, it is the opposing party's burden to meet the requirements under NRS 617.457(11) to exclude a claimant from receiving the benefits under NRS 617.457, which states:

> Failure to correct predisposing conditions which lead to heart disease when so ordered in writing by the examining physician subsequent to a physical examination required pursuant to subsection 4 or 5 excludes the employee from the benefits of this section if the correction is within the ability of the employee.

Second, the Appeals Officer's factual determinations were arbitrary and capricious as substantial evidence that Petitioner made reasonable attempts to correct his predisposing conditions was belied by the record. Despite Respondents' contentions, Las Vegas v. Burns is persuasive and should be applied here. No. 76099-COA 2019 WL 6003344 (Nev. Ct. App. Nov. 13, 2019) (finding that because there was no evidence in the record, the appeals officer's decision could not have been supported by substantial evidence). Petitioner's range fluctuation in his blood work is clear and convincing evidence that Petitioner engaged in diet and exercise to correct his predisposing conditions.

Petitioner contends that his annual physical examinations show a consistent effort, however unsuccessful it may have proven, to control predisposing conditions. Petitioner's annual physicals leading up to this claim simply do not support any assertion from Respondents that Petitioner failed to correct predisposing conditions that were within his ability to correct.

	2013	2014.	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Cholesterol	198	180	186	201	180	180	183
Triglycerides	129	202	108	145	97	137	113
LDL	117	96	117	120	109	103	112
HDL	55	44	47	52	52	49	48
Weight	199	205	207	208	208	215	209

With the support of the annual physicals from 2014 to 2019, Petitioner maintains that, to the best of his ability, he engaged in diet and exercise to correct the predisposing conditions when corrective actions were provided. Petitioner's 2013 annual physical revealed normal levels. (ROA pages 507-531) Petitioner's 2014 annual physical revealed elevated triglycerides. (ROA pages 532-552) Petitioner took the necessary steps to correct his triglyceride predisposing condition as evidenced by his normal 2015 annual physical. (ROA pages 553-573) Petitioner's 2016 annual physical showed slightly elevated cholesterol. (ROA pages 574-594) Petitioner again took the necessary steps to correct this predisposing condition as confirmed by his normal 2017 annual physical. (ROA pages 595-616) The subsequent annual physicals in 2018 and 2019 were also normal. (ROA pages 338-383) While Respondent identified Petitioner's weight in the 2017 (208) and 2019 (209) physicals, it should be noted that his weight was nearly identical in years 2013 (199), 2014 (205), 2015 (207) and 2016 208) and Petitioner was not instructed to lose weight in those years, thus revealing significant inconsistencies in what is Petitioner's ideal weight.

This evidence was substantial enough for the Appeals Officer to conclude that Petitioner took reasonable corrective action. Accordingly, the Appeals Officer incorrectly concluded that Petitioner failed to provide substantial evidence and did not take corrective action towards his predisposing conditions.

Í

26 //

17.

1	For these reasons, this Court FINDS	S that the A	ppeals Officer's Februa	ry 18, 2021
2	Decision and Order is not supported by s	ubstantial e	vidence and GRANTS	Petitioner's,
3	William Ferguson, Petition for Judicial Rev	iew reversin	g the Appeals Officer's l	Decision.
4		2024		
5	Dated this day of The Court FURTHER FINDS that this case		Dated this 16th day of	December, 2021
6			Konsld	foral
7		RONALD J.	TSREAT	·
8	]	DISTRICT (	COURTAF®®® ADAU EF Ronald J. Israel	43 JT
9			District Court Jud	ge
10	Submitted by:			
11	GGRM LAW FIRM			
12				
ž 13/				
514	LISA M. ANBERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 004907			
13 14 15 16	2770 South Maryland Parkway			
-	Suite 100			
-	Las Vegas, Nevada 89109 Attorneys for Petitioner			
17	Milor neys for Tellitories			,
18				
19	Approved as to form and content:			
20	LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH			
2				
- 22	DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ.			
23	Nevada Bar No. 005125			
24	2300 West Sahara Avenue Suite 900, Box 28			
25	Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Attorneys for Respondents			
26	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
27				

**CSERV** 

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

William Ferguson, Petitioner(s)

CASE NO: A-21-830966-J

VS.

DEPT. NO. Department 28

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Respondent(s)

# **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District Court. The foregoing Order Granting Motion 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: 12/16/2021

Daniel Schwartz

daniel.schwartz@lewisbrisbois.com

Joel Reeves

joel reeves@lewisbrisbois.com

robert windrem

rwindrem@ggrmlawfirm.com

Lisa Anderson, Esq.

landerson@ggrmlawfirm.com

Stephanie Jensen

stephanie jensen@lewisbrisbois.com

22

23

25

26

27

Electronically Filed
1/3/2022 4:15 PM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **ASTA** DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 005125 L. MICHAEL FRIEND, ESQ. 3 Nevada Bar No. 011131 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP 2300 West Sahara Ave, Suite 900, Box 28 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 5 Phone: (702) 893-3383 Facsimile: (702) 366-9563 Email: daniel.schwartz@lewisbrisbois.com Email: michael.friend@lewisbrisbois.com Attorneys for Appellants Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and Cannon Cochran Management Services, Inc. (CCMSI) 8 9 10 DISTRICT COURT 11 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 12 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE 13 DEPARTMENT and CCMSI, 14 Appellants, CASE NO: A-21-830966-J DEPT. NO.: XXVIII 15 v. 16 WILLIAM FERGUSON, 17 Respondent. 18 19 CASE APPEAL STATEMENT Name of appellants filing this case appeal statement: 1. 20 21 Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and Cannon Cochran Management Services, Inc. 22 2. Identify the judge issuing the decision, judgment, or order appealed from: 23 Hon. Ronald J. Israel, Eighth Judicial District Court Judge 24 25 26 27 28

LEWIS
BRISBOIS
BISGAARD
& SMITH LIP

4867-5911-7064.1 / 33307-462

Case Number: A-21-830966-J

3. Identify each appellant and the name and address of counsel for each appellant: 1 2 Daniel L. Schwartz, Esq. L. Michael Friend, Esq. 3 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP 2300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 900, Box 28 4 Las Vegas, NV 89102 Attorneys for Appellants 5 LAS VÉGAS MÊTROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT and CANNON COCHRAN MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC. 6 4. Identify each respondent and the name and address of appellate counsel, if known, 7 for each respondent (if the name of a respondent's appellate counsel is unknown, indicate as much 8 9 and provide the name and address of that respondent's trial counsel): : 10 Lisa Anderson, Esq. **GGRM LAW FIRM** 11 2770 S. Maryland Pkwy., Ste. 100 Las Vegas, NV 89109 12 Attorneys for Respondent William Ferguson 13 5. Indicate whether any attorney identified above in response to question 3 or 4 is not 14 licensed to practice law in Nevada and, if so, whether the district court granted that attorney 15 permission to appear under SCR 42 (attach a copy of any district court order granting such 16 17 permission): 18 All attorneys identified above are licensed to practice law in Nevada. 19 Indicate whether appellant was represented by appointed or retained counsel in the 6. 20 district court: 21 Appellants retained counsel in the District Court. 22 7. Indicate whether appellant is represented by appointed or retained counsel on 23 appeal: 24 Appellants are represented by retained counsel on appeal. 25 26 27 28

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

8. Indicate whether appellant was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and the date of entry of the district court order granting such leave:

Appellants were not granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

9. Indicate the date the proceedings commenced in the district court (e.g., date complaint, indictment, information, or petition was filed):

The Petition for Judicial Review of the Appeals Officer's Decision of February 18, 2021, was filed on March 11, 2021.

10. Provide a brief description of the nature of the action and result in the district court, including the type of judgment or order being appealed and the relief granted by the district court:

This is a workers' compensation case involving a police officer's claim for heart disease under NRS 617.457 (the Heart & Lung Bill). Claimant met the requirements under the statute for the conclusive presumption that his heart disease arose out of and in the course and scope of his employment (i.e., he was employed as an officer for over 2 years and he was diagnosed with diseases of the heart causing disablement).

An officer can, however, be excluded from the conclusive presumption under NRS 617.457(11). That section requires claimants to participate in yearly examinations which are provided by the employer. If at that yearly examination, the examining physician identifies a condition which is predisposing a claimant to heart disease (such as smoking, being overweight, or having elevated triglycerides) and orders the claimant to correct the same in writing, it is incumbent upon the claimant to at least attempt to correct the same if it is within his ability to correct or claimants can be excluded from the conclusive presumption. If the claimant does not correct the predisposing condition or at least make a good faith effort to attempt

4867-5911-7064.1

to correct the condition, the claimant is not entitled to any benefits under NRS 617.457.

In this case, Appellant Administrator denied Claimant's heart disease claim because he failed to correct or make a good faith effort to correct predisposing conditions that were within his ability to correct (i.e., being overweight and high cholesterol). Claimant appealed that determination.

On February 18, 2021, after receiving written closing briefs, the Appeals Officer affirmed claim denial for the 2020 claim. The Appeals Officer found Claimant did establish a disability and thus presumptively made out a claim. However, Claimant failed to attempt to correct conditions which were predisposing him to heart disease. Therefore, claim denial was proper.

Claimant filed a Petition for Judicial Review of the Appeals Officer's Decision and Order, alleging the Appeals Officer improperly concluded Claimant was excluded from the conclusive presumption related to his 2020 claim based on his failure to correct predisposing conditions within his ability to correct. Following briefing on the subject, the District Court issued an Order Granting Claimant's Petition for Judicial Review on December 16, 2021. The District Court ruled that the Appeals Officer's was arbitrary and capricious and his conclusions lacked substantial evidence.

Appellants seek review of this decision. Appellants believe the District Court's reversal was based on reweighing the evidence.

. .

..

| · · ·

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

4867-5911-7064.1

1 11. Indicate whether the case has previously been the subject of an appeal to or original 2 writ proceeding in the Supreme Court and, if so, the caption and Supreme Court docket number of 3 the prior proceeding: 4 No. 5 Indicate whether this appeal involves child custody or visitation: 12. 6 No. 7 13. If this is a civil case, indicate whether this appeal involves the possibility of 8 9 settlement 10 Yes. 11 DATED this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of January, 2022. 12 Respectfully submitted, 13 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP 14 /s/ L. Michael Friend DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. 15 Nevada Bar No. 005125 L. MICHAEL FRIEND, ESQ. 16 Nevada Bar No. 011131 2300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 900, Box 28 17 Las Vegas, NV 89102 Phone: (702) 893-3383 18 Fax: (702) 366-9563 Attorneys for Appellants 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

4867-5911-7064.1

# **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** Pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 5(b), I hereby certify that, on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of January, 2022, service of the CASE APPEAL STATEMENT was made this date by depositing a true copy of the same for mailing, first class mail, at Las Vegas, Nevada, addressed follows: Lisa Anderson, Esq. GGRM LAW FIRM 2770 S. Maryland Pkwy., Ste. 100 Las Vegas, NV 89109 /s/ Stephanie Jensen An employee of LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW 4867-5911-7064.1

### EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

# CASE SUMMARY CASE No. A-21-830966-J

William Ferguson, Petitioner(s)

VS.

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Respondent

**(s)** 

Location: Department 28
Judicial Officer: Israel, Ronald J.
Filed on: 03/11/2021

Case Number History:

Cross-Reference Case A830966

Number:

**CASE INFORMATION** 

§

§

**Statistical Closures** 

11/18/2021 Summary Judgment

Case Type: Worker's Compensation

· Appeal

Case Status: 11/18/2021 Closed

DATE CASE ASSIGNMENT

**Current Case Assignment** 

Case Number A-21-830966-J
Court Department 28
Date Assigned 06/01/2021
Judicial Officer Israel, Ronald J.

PARTY INFORMATION

Petitioner Ferguson, William Lead Attorneys
Anderson

Anderson, Lisa M Retained 7023841616(W)

Respondent CCMSI Schwartz, Daniel L

*Retained* 702-893-3383(W)

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Schwartz, Daniel L

Retained 702-893-3383(W)

The Department of Administration Hearings Division

DATE EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT INDEX

**EVENTS** 

03/11/2021 Petition for Judicial Review

Filed by: Petitioner Ferguson, William [1] Petition for Judicial Review

03/16/2021 Notice of Intent to Participate

Filed By: Respondent Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Respondent CCMSI

[2] Notice of Intent to Participate

03/16/2021 Initial Appearance Fee Disclosure

Filed By: Respondent Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Respondent CCMSI

[3] Initial Appearance Fee Disclosure

05/28/2021 Peremptory Challenge

Filed by: Respondent Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Respondent CCMSI

[4] Peremptory Challenge of Judge

# EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

# CASE SUMMARY CASE No. A-21-830966-J

06/01/2021	Notice of Department Reassignment [5] Notice of Department Reassignment
06/25/2021	Transmittal of Record on Appeal Party: Respondent The Department of Administration Hearings Division [6] Transmittal of Record on Appealr
06/25/2021	Affidavit  Filed By: Respondent The Department of Administration Hearings Division  [7] Affidavit
06/25/2021	Certification of Transmittal [8] Certification of Transmittal
08/06/2021	Brief Filed By: Petitioner Ferguson, William [9] Petitioner's Opening Brief
09/08/2021	Brief Filed By: Respondent Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Respondent CCMSI [10] Respondents' Answering Brief
10/08/2021	Brief Filed By: Petitioner Ferguson, William [11] Petitioner's Reply Brief
10/15/2021	Request  Filed by: Petitioner Ferguson, William  [12] Request for Hearing on Petitioner's Petition for Judicial Review
10/19/2021	Order [13] Order Scheduling In Chambers Decision On Petition For Judicial Review
12/16/2021	Order Granting Motion  Filed By: Petitioner Ferguson, William  [14] Order Granting Petition For Judicial Review
12/17/2021	Notice of Entry of Order  Filed By: Petitioner Ferguson, William  [15] Notice of Entry of Order
01/03/2022	Notice of Appeal  Filed By: Respondent Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Respondent CCMSI  [16] Notice of Appeal
01/03/2022	Case Appeal Statement  Filed By: Respondent Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Respondent CCMSI  [17] Case Appeal Statement
01/03/2022	Motion Filed By: Respondent Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Respondent CCMSI [18] APPELLANTS MOTION FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL TO THE NEVADA SUPREME

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

# CASE SUMMARY CASE NO. A-21-830966-J

**COURT** 

# **DISPOSITIONS**

12/16/2021

Order Granting Judicial Review (Judicial Officer: Israel, Ronald J.)

Debtors: Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Respondent), CCMSI (Respondent), The Department of Administration Hearings Division (Respondent)

Creditors: William Ferguson (Petitioner)

Judgment: 12/16/2021, Docketed: 12/17/2021

# **HEARINGS**

11/18/2021

Petition for Judicial Review (3:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Israel, Ronald J.)

Decision Made; Minute Order - No Hearing Held

Journal Entry Details:

Petitioner filed this Petition for Judicial Review on August 6, 2021. Respondents filed their Answer on September 8, 2021, in which Petitioner replied on October 8, 2021. Petitioner seeks judicial review of whether there was substantial evidence for Respondents to deny liability of his claims of occupationally related heart disease. Judicial review of a final decision of an agency is governed by NRS 233B.135. An agency s factual determinations may be disturbed on appeal if they are arbitrary and capricious due to the lack of substantial evidence. Barrick Goldstrike Mine v. Peterson, 116 Nev. 541, 547, 2 P.3d 850, 854 (2000). On the other hand, an agency s legal determination is reviewed de novo. SIIS v. Khweiss, 108 Nev. 123, 126, 825 P.2d 218, 220 (1992). Here, both factual and legal determinations are at issue as to whether Petitioner satisfied the legal requirements of NRS 617.457 to qualify for the conclusive presumption to claim compensation for his alleged occupationally related heart disease. The Court will address each issue in turn. First, the Appeals Officer made an error of law when applying the burden of proof of NRS 617.457. The opposing party, not the claimant, has the burden to meet the requirements under NRS 617.457(11) to disqualify a claimant from receiving compensatory benefits. See Manwilll v. Clark County, 123 Nev. 238, 243 44, 162 P.3d 876, 880 (2007). Applying here, Respondents had the burden to prove that Petitioner did not take corrective action to lower his weight, triglycerides, and cholesterol. As such, the Appeals officer erred in shifting this burden to Petitioner. Second, the Appeals Officer s factual determinations were arbitrary and capricious as substantial evidence that Petitioner made reasonable attempts to correct his predisposing conditions was belied by the record. Despite Respondents contentions, Las Vegas v. Burns is persuasive and should be applied here. No. 76099-COA 2019 WL 6003344 (Nev. Ct. App. Nov. 13, 2019) (finding that because there was no evidence in the record, the appeals officer s decision could not have been supported by substantial evidence). Petitioner s range fluctuation in his blood work is clear and convincing evidence that Petitioner engaged in diet and exercise to correct his predisposing conditions. This evidence was substantial enough for the Appeals Officer to conclude that Petitioner took reasonable corrective action. Accordingly, the Appeals Officer incorrectly concluded that Petitioner failed to provide substantial evidence and did not take corrective action towards his predisposing conditions. For these reasons, the Appeals Officer s Decision and Order is REVERSED. This Decision sets forth the Court's intended disposition on the subject but anticipates further Order of the Court to make such disposition effective as an Order. Such Order should set forth a synopsis of the supporting reasons proffered to the Court in briefing. Petitioner s counsel is to prepare the Order and submit to Chambers for consideration in accordance with EDCR 7.21. CLERK S NOTE: A copy of this Minute Order has been electronically served to all registered users on this case in the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing System.;

DATE FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Respondent CCMSI	
Total Charges	474.00
Total Payments and Credits	474.00
Balance Due as of 1/4/2022	0.00
Respondent Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department	
Total Charges	253.00
Total Payments and Credits	253.00
Balance Due as of 1/4/2022	0.00

# DISTRICT COURT CIVIL COVER SHEET

	County, Nevada
Case No.	
	(Assigned by Clerk's Office)

CASE NO: A-21-830966-J Department 4

	(Assigned by Clerk	fice)			
I. Party Information (provide both h	ome and mailing addresses if different)				
Plaintiff(s) (name/address/phone):		Defendant(s) (name/address/phone):			
WILLIAM FEI	RGUSON	Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, CCMSI			
		and the Department of Administration			
		Hearings Division			
		, rounn	90 211101011		
Au ( 111 /1 )					
Attorney (name/address/phone): Lisa M. Ande	roop Eog	Attorney (name/address/phor			
	,	Daniel L. Schwartz, Esq.			
Greenman Goldberg			Bisgaard & Smith		
2770 South Marylan			ı Avenue, #900, Box 28		
Las Vegas, Nevada 89	109 702-384-1616	₋as Vegas, Nevad	a 89102 702-893-3383		
II. Nature of Controversy (please s	select the one most applicable filing type	low)			
Civil Case Filing Types	resect the one most approcedic fining type	1011/			
Real Property		Torts			
Landlord/Tenant	Negligence	Other Torts			
Unlawful Detainer	Auto	Product Liabil	itv		
Other Landlord/Tenant	Premises Liability	Intentional Mi	•		
Title to Property	Other Negligence	Employment T			
Judicial Foreclosure	Malpractice	Insurance Tort			
Other Title to Property	Medical/Dental	Other Tort			
Other Real Property	Legal				
Condemnation/Eminent Domain	Accounting				
Other Real Property	Other Malpractice				
Probate	Construction Defect & Cont	ot Tud	cial Review/Appeal		
Probate (select case type and estate value)	Construction Defect	Judicial Review	Ciai Keview/Appeai		
Summary Administration	Chapter 40	Foreclosure M	ediation Case		
General Administration	Other Construction Defect	Petition to Sea	*		
Special Administration	Contract Case	Mental Compe			
Set Aside	Uniform Commercial Code	Nevada State Agency Appeal			
Trust/Conservatorship	Building and Construction	Department of Motor Vehicle			
Other Probate	Insurance Carrier	Worker's Compensation			
Estate Value	Commercial Instrument	Other Nevada			
Over \$200,000	Collection of Accounts	Appeal Other	State Agency		
Between \$100,000 and \$200,000	Employment Contract	1	owar Court		
Under \$100,000 or Unknown	Other Contract	Appeal from Lower Court Other Judicial Review/Appeal			
Under \$2,500	Culci Contract	Outer sudiciar	Keview/Appear		
	1 33724				
	il Writ		ther Civil Filing		
Civil Writ	<b>—</b>	Other Civil Filin			
Writ of Habeas Corpus	Writ of Prohibition	I = "	f Minor's Claim		
Writ of Mandamus	Other Civil Writ	Foreign Judgm			
Writ of Quo Warrant		Other Civil Ma	A CONTRACT OF THE CONTRACT OF		
Business C	ourt filings should be filed using the	usiness Court civil coversh	eet.		
March 11, 202	1	V-1//	$\mathcal{A} \setminus \overline{}$		
Date	<b>-</b> /	Signature of initiating part	v or representative		
	(		,		

See other side for family-related case filings.

antition profit and the second and t

**ORDG** 

1

LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 004907 **GGRM LAW FIRM** 3 2770 South Maryland Parkway Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89109 Phone: (702) 384-1616 Facsimile: (702) 384-2990 6 Email: landerson@ggrmlawfirm.com Attorneys for Petitioner 7 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 WILLIAM FERGUSON, 11 Petitioner 12 CASE NO.: A-21-830966-J 13 VS. ) DEPT. NO.: XXVIII 14 LAS VEGAS METROPOLLITAN POLICE) DEPARTMENT, CCMSI, and THE 15 DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, 16 HEARINGS DIVISION, 17 Respondents. 18

# ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

This matter came before this Court on the Petition for Judicial Review filed by the Petitioner, WILLIAM FERGUSON. Petitioner was represented by LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ. of the GGRM LAW FIRM. Respondents, LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT and CCMSI, were represented by DANIAL L. SCHWARTZ. ESQ. of the law firm LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH. No other parties were present or represented. After reviewing the record and considering the briefs, this matter is decided as follows:

27

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TORNIY 13

This matter came before this Court on November 18, 2021 for hearing on the March 11, 2021 Petition for Judicial Review. The Court has reviewed the August 6, 2021 Petitioner's Opening Brief, the September 8, 2021 Respondent's Answering Brief, and the October 8, 2021 Petitioner's Reply Brief, and the entirety of the record, including the June 25, 2021 Transmittal of Record on Appeal, which contains the Record on Appeal, and hereby FINDS that pursuant to NRS 233B.135, the Appeals Officer's February 18, 2021 Decision and Order is arbitrary and capricious and not supported by substantial evidence in the Record on Appeal.

Judicial review of a final decision of an agency is governed by NRS 233B.155. An agency's factual determinations may be disturbed on appeal if they are arbitrary and capricious due to the lack of substantial evidence. Barrick Goldstrike Mine v. Peterson, 116 Nev. 541, 547, 2 P.3d 850, 854 (2000). On the other hand, an agency's legal determination is reviewed de novo. SIIS v. Khweiss, 108 Nev. 123, 126, 825 P.2d 218, 220 (1992). Here, both factual and legal determinations are at issue as to whether Petitioner satisfied the legal requirements of NRS 617.457 to qualify for the conclusive presumption to claim compensation for his alleged occupationally related heart disease. The Court will address each issue in turn.

First, the Appeals Officer made an error of law when applying the burden of proof of NRS 617.457. The opposing party, not the claimant, has the burden to meet the requirements under NRS 617.457(11) to disqualify a claimant from received compensatory benefits. See Manwill v. Clark County, 123 Nev. 238, 243-44, 162 P.3d 876, 880 (2007). Applying here, Respondents had the burden to prove that Petitioner did not take corrective action to lower his weight, triglycerides, and cholesterol. As such, the Appeals Officer erred in shifting this burden to Petitioner.

III

NIURY ATTORNEYS

The Manwill Court held that a claimant has no burden to disprove the failure to correct predisposing conditions did not lead to a claimant's heart disease under NRS 617.457(11), or that no predisposing conditions exist, to receive the benefits under NRS 617.457. See, 123 Nev. 238, 242-44 (2007). The predisposing conditions section under NRS 617.457 has existed since 1973. NRS 617.457(11); see, 1973 Nev. Stat. ch. 504, § 1, at 769. In 1989, the Nevada legislature set the current conclusive presumption found in NRS 617.457(1). 1989 Nev. Stat. ch. 480, § 2, at 1021. Since that time, the Nevada legislature has only expanded the ability for claims under NRS 617.457 to be accepted. Compare NRS 617.457(1989) with NRS 617.457(2017); see also, Manwill, 123 Nev. 238; Gallagher v. City of Las Vegas, 114 Nev. 595, 601, 959 P.2d 519, 522 (1998).

The Manwill Court knew the existence of, and failure to correct, predisposing conditions would exclude a claimant from benefits under NRS 617.457. Manwill, 123 Nev. 238, 242-43. However, the Court found a claimant has absolutely no burden to show they do not have any predisposition conditions and/or had the ability to correct them but failed to do so. See, Id. at 244. If such a burden and requirement existed, then the Nevada Supreme Court would have listed it as such, but instead merely requires a claimant to "show only two things: heart disease and five years' qualifying employment before disablement." Id. at 242-44. The claimant in Manwill did not have to show the correction of a predisposing condition within their ability to correct nor did he have to show no predisposing conditions existed. Id.

III

27 ||

As such, it is the opposing party's burden to meet the requirements under NRS 617.457(11) to exclude a claimant from receiving the benefits under NRS 617.457, which states:

Failure to correct predisposing conditions which lead to heart disease when so ordered in writing by the examining physician subsequent to a physical examination required pursuant to subsection 4 or 5 excludes the employee from the benefits of this section if the correction is within the ability of the employee.

Second, the Appeals Officer's factual determinations were arbitrary and capricious as substantial evidence that Petitioner made reasonable attempts to correct his predisposing conditions was belied by the record. Despite Respondents' contentions, <u>Las Vegas v. Burns</u> is persuasive and should be applied here. No. 76099-COA 2019 WL 6003344 (Nev. Ct. App. Nov. 13, 2019) (finding that because there was no evidence in the record, the appeals officer's decision could not have been supported by substantial evidence). Petitioner's range fluctuation in his blood work is clear and convincing evidence that Petitioner engaged in diet and exercise to correct his predisposing conditions.

Petitioner contends that his annual physical examinations show a consistent effort, however unsuccessful it may have proven, to control predisposing conditions. Petitioner's annual physicals leading up to this claim simply do not support any assertion from Respondents that Petitioner failed to correct predisposing conditions that were within his ability to correct.

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Cholesterol	198	180	186	201	180	180	183
Triglycerides	129	202	108	145	97	137	113
LDL	117	96	117	120	109	103	112
HDL	55	44	47	52	52	49	48
Weight	199	205	207	208	208	215	209

With the support of the annual physicals from 2014 to 2019, Petitioner maintains that, to the best of his ability, he engaged in diet and exercise to correct the predisposing conditions when corrective actions were provided. Petitioner's 2013 annual physical revealed normal levels. (ROA pages 507-531) Petitioner's 2014 annual physical revealed elevated triglycerides. (ROA pages 532-552) Petitioner took the necessary steps to correct his triglyceride predisposing condition as evidenced by his normal 2015 annual physical. (ROA pages 553-573) Petitioner's 2016 annual physical showed slightly elevated cholesterol. (ROA pages 574-594) Petitioner again took the necessary steps to correct this predisposing condition as confirmed by his normal 2017 annual physical. (ROA pages 595-616) The subsequent annual physicals in 2018 and 2019 were also normal. (ROA pages 338-383) While Respondent identified Petitioner's weight in the 2017 (208) and 2019 (209) physicals, it should be noted that his weight was nearly identical in years 2013 (199), 2014 (205), 2015 (207) and 2016 208) and Petitioner was not instructed to lose weight in those years, thus revealing significant inconsistencies in what is Petitioner's ideal weight.

This evidence was substantial enough for the Appeals Officer to conclude that Petitioner took reasonable corrective action. Accordingly, the Appeals Officer incorrectly concluded that Petitioner failed to provide substantial evidence and did not take corrective action towards his predisposing conditions.

III

26 | //

27 | ///

JT



1 **CSERV** 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 William Ferguson, Petitioner(s) CASE NO: A-21-830966-J 6 DEPT. NO. Department 28 VS. 7 8 Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, 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 Granting Motion 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: 12/16/2021 15 Daniel Schwartz daniel.schwartz@lewisbrisbois.com 16 Joel Reeves joel.reeves@lewisbrisbois.com 17 rwindrem@ggrmlawfirm.com robert windrem 18 Lisa Anderson, Esq. landerson@ggrmlawfirm.com 19 20 Stephanie Jensen stephanie.jensen@lewisbrisbois.com 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1 **NEOJ** LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ. 2 Nevada Bar No. 4907 3 **GGRM LAW FIRM** 2270 South Maryland Parkway, #100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89109 Phone: 702. 384.1616 ~ Fax: 702.384.2990 Email: landerson@ggrmlawfirm.com Attorneys for Petitioner 6 DISTRICT COURT 7 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 8 WILLIAM FERGUSON, 9 Petitioner, 10 CASE NO.: A-21-830966-J 11 VS. DEPT. NO.: XXVIII 12 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, CCMSI and THE ≟ 13 DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS DIVISION. 14 15 Respondents. 16 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER 17 18

**Electronically Filed** 12/17/2021 8:06 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT



19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TO: All parties of interest.

YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an Order was entered in the above-entitled matter on the 6<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021, a copy of which is attached.

DATED this 6 day of December, 2021.

**GGRM LAW FIRM** 

LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 4907

2770 South Maryland Parkway, #100

Las Vegas, Nevada 89109 Attorneys for Petitioner

# GGRM

NJURY ATTORNEYS

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of GGRM LAW FIRM, and that on the day of December, 2021, I caused the foregoing document entitled NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER to be served upon those persons designated by parties in the E-Service Master List for the above-referenced matter in the Eighth Judicial District Court eFiling System in accordance with the mandatory electronic service requirements of Administrative Order 14-2 and the Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules and depositing a true and correct copy in a sealed envelope, postage fully prepaid, addressed as follows:

Daniel L. Schwartz, Esq. LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH 2300 West Sahara Avenue Suite 900 Box 28 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

An Employee of the GGRM LAW FIRM

# ELECTRONICALLY SERVED 12/16/2021 10:43 AM

Electronically Filed 12/16/2021 10:42 AM CLERK OF THE COURT

PRY ALTORRISS

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

	11			
1	ORDG LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ.			
2	Nevada Bar No. 004907			
3	GGRM LAW FIRM 2770 South Maryland Parkway			
4	Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89109			
5	Phone: (702) 384-1616			
6	Facsimile: (702) 384-2990 Email: landerson@ggrmlawfirm	ı.com		
7	Attorneys for Petitioner			
8		DISTRIC	T COURT	
9		CLARK COUN	ITY, NEVADA	
10				
11	WILLIAM FERGUSON,	)		
12	Petitioner	)		
13	vs.	,	CASE NO. : DEPT. NO. :	A-21-830966-J XXVIII
14	LAS VEGAS METROPOLLIT	,	DEFI.NO.	AAVIII
15	DEPARTMENT, CCMSI, and DEPARTMENT OF ADMINIS	THE )		
16	HEARINGS DIVISION,	)		
17	Respondents.	)		
18		)		

# ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

This matter came before this Court on the Petition for Judicial Review filed by the Petitioner, WILLIAM FERGUSON. Petitioner was represented by LISA M. ANDERSON, ESQ. of the GGRM LAW FIRM. Respondents, LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT and CCMSI, were represented by DANIAL L. SCHWARTZ. ESQ. of the law firm LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH. No other parties were present or represented. After reviewing the record and considering the briefs, this matter is decided as follows:

28 ///

1

Casa Number A 94 990066 J

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

This matter came before this Court on November 18, 2021 for hearing on the March 11, 2021 Petition for Judicial Review. The Court has reviewed the August 6, 2021 Petitioner's Opening Brief, the September 8, 2021 Respondent's Answering Brief, and the October 8, 2021 Petitioner's Reply Brief, and the entirety of the record, including the June 25, 2021 Transmittal of Record on Appeal, which contains the Record on Appeal, and hereby FINDS that pursuant to NRS 233B.135, the Appeals Officer's February 18, 2021 Decision and Order is arbitrary and capricious and not supported by substantial evidence in the Record on Appeal.

Judicial review of a final decision of an agency is governed by NRS 233B.155. An agency's factual determinations may be disturbed on appeal if they are arbitrary and capricious due to the lack of substantial evidence. Barrick Goldstrike Mine v. Peterson, 116 Nev. 541, 547. 2 P.3d 850, 854 (2000). On the other hand, an agency's legal determination is reviewed de novo. SIIS v. Khweiss, 108 Nev. 123, 126, 825 P.2d 218, 220 (1992). Here, both factual and legal determinations are at issue as to whether Petitioner satisfied the legal requirements of NRS 617.457 to qualify for the conclusive presumption to claim compensation for his alleged occupationally related heart disease. The Court will address each issue in turn.

First, the Appeals Officer made an error of law when applying the burden of proof of NRS 617.457. The opposing party, not the claimant, has the burden to meet the requirements under NRS 617.457(11) to disqualify a claimant from received compensatory benefits. See Manwill v. Clark County, 123 Nev. 238, 243-44, 162 P.3d 876, 880 (2007). Applying here, Respondents had the burden to prove that Petitioner did not take corrective action to lower his weight, triglycerides, and cholesterol. As such, the Appeals Officer erred in shifting this burden to Petitioner.

III

2 14

The Manwill Court held that a claimant has no burden to disprove the failure to correct predisposing conditions did not lead to a claimant's heart disease under NRS 617.457(11), or that no predisposing conditions exist, to receive the benefits under NRS 617.457. See, 123 Nev. 238, 242-44 (2007). The predisposing conditions section under NRS 617.457 has existed since 1973. NRS 617.457(11); see, 1973 Nev. Stat. ch. 504, § 1, at 769. In 1989, the Nevada legislature set the current conclusive presumption found in NRS 617.457(1). 1989 Nev. Stat. ch. 480, § 2, at 1021. Since that time, the Nevada legislature has only expanded the ability for claims under NRS 617.457 to be accepted. Compare NRS 617.457(1989) with NRS 617.457(2017); see also, Manwill, 123 Nev. 238; Gallagher v. City of Las Vegas, 114 Nev. 595, 601, 959 P.2d 519, 522 (1998).

The Manwill Court knew the existence of, and failure to correct, predisposing conditions would exclude a claimant from benefits under NRS 617.457. Manwill, 123 Nev. 238, 242-43. However, the Court found a claimant has absolutely no burden to show they do not have any predisposition conditions and/or had the ability to correct them but failed to do so. See, Id. at 244. If such a burden and requirement existed, then the Nevada Supreme Court would have listed it as such, but instead merely requires a claimant to "show only two things: heart disease and five years' qualifying employment before disablement." Id. at 242-44. The claimant in Manwill did not have to show the correction of a predisposing condition within their ability to correct nor did he have to show no predisposing conditions existed. Id.

///

//.

///

AITORNEL

As such, it is the opposing party's burden to meet the requirements under NRS 617.457(11) to exclude a claimant from receiving the benefits under NRS 617.457, which states:

Failure to correct predisposing conditions which lead to heart disease when so ordered in writing by the examining physician subsequent to a physical examination required pursuant to subsection 4 or 5 excludes the employee from the benefits of this section if the correction is within the ability of the employee.

Second, the Appeals Officer's factual determinations were arbitrary and capricious as substantial evidence that Petitioner made reasonable attempts to correct his predisposing conditions was belied by the record. Despite Respondents' contentions, <u>Las Vegas v. Burns</u> is persuasive and should be applied here. No. 76099-COA 2019 WL 6003344 (Nev. Ct. App. Nov. 13, 2019) (finding that because there was no evidence in the record, the appeals officer's decision could not have been supported by substantial evidence). Petitioner's range fluctuation in his blood work is clear and convincing evidence that Petitioner engaged in diet and exercise to correct his predisposing conditions.

Petitioner contends that his annual physical examinations show a consistent effort, however unsuccessful it may have proven, to control predisposing conditions. Petitioner's annual physicals leading up to this claim simply do not support any assertion from Respondents that Petitioner failed to correct predisposing conditions that were within his ability to correct.

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Cholesterol	198	180	186	201	180	180	183
Triglycerides	129	202	108	145	97	137	113
LDL	117	96	117	120	109	103	112
HDL	55	44	47	52	52	49	48
Weight	199	205	207	208	208	215	209

With the support of the annual physicals from 2014 to 2019, Petitioner maintains that, to the best of his ability, he engaged in diet and exercise to correct the predisposing conditions when corrective actions were provided. Petitioner's 2013 annual physical revealed normal levels. (ROA pages 507-531) Petitioner's 2014 annual physical revealed elevated triglycerides. (ROA pages 532-552) Petitioner took the necessary steps to correct his triglyceride predisposing condition as evidenced by his normal 2015 annual physical. (ROA pages 553-573) Petitioner's 2016 annual physical showed slightly elevated cholesterol. (ROA pages 574-594) Petitioner again took the necessary steps to correct this predisposing condition as confirmed by his normal 2017 annual physical. (ROA pages 595-616) The subsequent annual physicals in 2018 and 2019 were also normal. (ROA pages 338-383) While Respondent identified Petitioner's weight in the 2017 (208) and 2019 (209) physicals, it should be noted that his weight was nearly identical in years 2013 (199), 2014 (205), 2015 (207) and 2016 208) and Petitioner was not instructed to lose weight in those years, thus revealing significant inconsistencies in what is Petitioner's ideal weight.

This evidence was substantial enough for the Appeals Officer to conclude that Petitioner took reasonable corrective action. Accordingly, the Appeals Officer incorrectly concluded that Petitioner failed to provide substantial evidence and did not take corrective action towards his predisposing conditions.

///

III

25 111 26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27

28

///

For these reasons, this Court FINDS that the Appeals Officer's February 18, 2021 1 Decision and Order is not supported by substantial evidence and GRANTS Petitioner's, 2 3 William Ferguson, Petition for Judicial Review reversing the Appeals Officer's Decision. 4 Dated this day of \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2021. 5 Dated this 16th day of December, 2021 The Court FURTHER FINDS that this case is closed. 6 7 RONALD J. ISREAL DISTRICT COURTATED SE ADA0 EF43
Ronald J. Israel 8 JT **District Court Judge** 9 Submitted by: 10 11 GGRM LAW FIRM. 12 13 LISA M. ANDERSON, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 004907 2770 South Maryland Parkway Suite 100 16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89109 Attorneys for Petitioner 17 18 Approved as to form and content: 19 LEWIS-BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH 20 DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. 22 Nevada Bar No. 005125 23 2300 West Sahara Avenue Suite 900, Box 28 24 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 25 Attorneys for Respondents 26



27

1 **CSERV** 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 William Ferguson, Petitioner(s) CASE NO: A-21-830966-J 6 vs. DEPT. NO. Department 28 7 Las Vegas Metropolitan Police 8 Department, 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 Granting Motion 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: 12/16/2021 15 daniel.schwartz@lewisbrisbois.com Daniel Schwartz 16 Joel Reeves joel.reeves@lewisbrisbois.com 17 robert windrem rwindrem@ggrmlawfirm.com 18 Lisa Anderson, Esq. landerson@ggrmlawfirm.com 19 Stephanie Jensen stephanie.jensen@lewisbrisbois.com 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

# DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Morker's Compensation COURT MINUTES November 18, 2021

A-21-830966-J William Ferguson, Petitioner(s)
vs.
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Respondent(s)

November 18, 2021 3:00 AM Petition for Judicial Review Minute Order - No Hearing Held

**HEARD BY:** Israel, Ronald J. **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 15C

**COURT CLERK:** Christopher Darling

**RECORDER:** 

**REPORTER:** 

PARTIES PRESENT:

# **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Petitioner filed this Petition for Judicial Review on August 6, 2021. Respondents filed their Answer on September 8, 2021, in which Petitioner replied on October 8, 2021. Petitioner seeks judicial review of whether there was substantial evidence for Respondents to deny liability of his claims of occupationally related heart disease.

Judicial review of a final decision of an agency is governed by NRS 233B.135. An agency s factual determinations may be disturbed on appeal if they are arbitrary and capricious due to the lack of substantial evidence. Barrick Goldstrike Mine v. Peterson, 116 Nev. 541, 547, 2 P.3d 850, 854 (2000). On the other hand, an agency s legal determination is reviewed de novo. SIIS v. Khweiss, 108 Nev. 123, 126, 825 P.2d 218, 220 (1992). Here, both factual and legal determinations are at issue as to whether Petitioner satisfied the legal requirements of NRS 617.457 to qualify for the conclusive presumption to claim compensation for his alleged occupationally related heart disease. The Court will address each issue in turn.

First, the Appeals Officer made an error of law when applying the burden of proof of NRS 617.457. The opposing party, not the claimant, has the burden to meet the requirements under NRS

PRINT DATE: 01/04/2022 Page 1 of 2 Minutes Date: November 18, 2021

### A-21-830966-J

617.457(11) to disqualify a claimant from receiving compensatory benefits. See Manwilll v. Clark County, 123 Nev. 238, 243 44, 162 P.3d 876, 880 (2007). Applying here, Respondents had the burden to prove that Petitioner did not take corrective action to lower his weight, triglycerides, and cholesterol. As such, the Appeals officer erred in shifting this burden to Petitioner.

Second, the Appeals Officer's factual determinations were arbitrary and capricious as substantial evidence that Petitioner made reasonable attempts to correct his predisposing conditions was belied by the record. Despite Respondents contentions, Las Vegas v. Burns is persuasive and should be applied here. No. 76099-COA 2019 WL 6003344 (Nev. Ct. App. Nov. 13, 2019) (finding that because there was no evidence in the record, the appeals officer's decision could not have been supported by substantial evidence). Petitioner's range fluctuation in his blood work is clear and convincing evidence that Petitioner engaged in diet and exercise to correct his predisposing conditions. This evidence was substantial enough for the Appeals Officer to conclude that Petitioner took reasonable corrective action. Accordingly, the Appeals Officer incorrectly concluded that Petitioner failed to provide substantial evidence and did not take corrective action towards his predisposing conditions. For these reasons, the Appeals Officer's Decision and Order is REVERSED.

This Decision sets forth the Court's intended disposition on the subject but anticipates further Order of the Court to make such disposition effective as an Order. Such Order should set forth a synopsis of the supporting reasons proffered to the Court in briefing. Petitioner's counsel is to prepare the Order and submit to Chambers for consideration in accordance with EDCR 7.21.

CLERK S NOTE: A copy of this Minute Order has been electronically served to all registered users on this case in the Eighth Judicial District Court Electronic Filing System.

# **Certification of Copy**

State of Nevada
County of Clark

I, Steven D. Grierson, the Clerk of the Court of the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of the hereinafter stated original document(s):

NOTICE OF APPEAL; CASE APPEAL STATEMENT; DISTRICT COURT DOCKET ENTRIES; CIVIL COVER SHEET; ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW; NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER; DISTRICT COURT MINUTES

WILLIAM FERGUSON,

Petitioner(s),

VS.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT; CCMSI; THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS DIVISION,

Respondent(s),

now on file and of record in this office.

Case No: A-21-830966-J

Dept No: XXVIII

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto Set my hand and Affixed the seal of the Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada This 4 day of January 2022.

Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court

Amanda Hampton, Deputy Clerk