

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Electronically Filed  
Feb 02 2022 11:07 a.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

LISA BRESLAW,  
Appellant(s),

vs.

PETER COOPER,  
Respondent(s),

Case No: A-21-837948-C

Docket No: 84072

# RECORD ON APPEAL VOLUME 3

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT  
LISA BRESLAW, PROPER PERSON  
7050 SHADY PALMS ST.  
LAS VEGAS, NV 89131

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT  
SAGAR RAICH, ESQ.  
6785 S. EASTERN AVE., STE 5  
LAS VEGAS, NV 89119

**I N D E X**

<b><u>VOLUME:</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NUMBER:</u></b>
1	1 - 240
2	241 - 480
3	481 - 491

**I N D E X**

<b><u>VOL</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>	<b><u>PLEADING</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NUMBER:</u></b>
1	07/29/2021	AFFIDAVIT OF DUE DILIGENCE	72 - 75
1	08/24/2021	AFFIDAVIT OF DUE DILIGENCE	82 - 85
1	10/27/2021	AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE	107 - 107
2	01/10/2022	CASE APPEAL STATEMENT	441 - 442
3	02/02/2022	CERTIFICATION OF COPY AND TRANSMITTAL OF RECORD	
1	11/29/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF CURATIVE ACTION	165 - 166
2	12/14/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF CURATIVE ACTION	315 - 316
2	01/03/2022	CLERK'S NOTICE OF CURATIVE ACTION	414 - 415
1	07/16/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	65 - 67
1	11/16/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	159 - 161
1	11/16/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	162 - 164
2	12/10/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	310 - 312
2	12/28/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	395 - 397
2	12/28/2021	CLERK'S NOTICE OF NONCONFORMING DOCUMENT	398 - 400
1	07/15/2021	COMPLAINT	1 - 7
1	11/02/2021	DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS	108 - 120
3	02/02/2022	DISTRICT COURT MINUTES	489 - 491
2	12/29/2021	ERRATA FOR AMENDED COMPLAINT	403 - 404
2	12/15/2021	ERRATA FOR MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A SUR-REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND THE ATTACHED SUR-REPLY	318 - 318
1	11/04/2021	ERRATA FOR OPPOSITION MOTION	142 - 143
1	11/06/2021	ERRATA FOR OPPOSITION MOTION (UPDATED)	157 - 158

**I N D E X**

<b><u>VOL</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>	<b><u>PLEADING</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NUMBER:</u></b>
2	12/24/2021	ERRATA FOR REPLY RE: DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND OPPOSITION TO EX PARTE MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE	345 - 345
2	12/28/2021	ERRATA TO AMENDED COMPLAINT	401 - 402
2	12/16/2021	EX PARTE MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE (HEARING REQUESTED ON SHORTENED TIME)	319 - 321
1	11/05/2021	EXHIBIT 17	144 - 144
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 1	8 - 8
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 10	57 - 58
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 11	59 - 60
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 12	61 - 62
1	08/30/2021	EXHIBIT 13	87 - 90
1	08/30/2021	EXHIBIT 14	91 - 91
1	11/05/2021	EXHIBIT 17	145 - 145
1	11/05/2021	EXHIBIT 18	146 - 155
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 2	9 - 9
1	11/05/2021	EXHIBIT 20	156 - 156
1	12/08/2021	EXHIBIT 21	197 - 198
1	12/08/2021	EXHIBIT 22	199 - 204
1	12/08/2021	EXHIBIT 23	205 - 207
1	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 24	208 - 209
1	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 25	210 - 212
1	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 26 (CONTINUED)	213 - 240

**I N D E X**

<b><u>VOL</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>	<b><u>PLEADING</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NUMBER:</u></b>
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 26 (CONTINUATION)	241 - 290
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 27	291 - 291
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 28	292 - 293
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 29	294 - 295
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 3	10 - 35
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 30	296 - 297
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 31	298 - 300
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 32	301 - 304
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 33 (REFILED)	307 - 309
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 34	305 - 305
2	12/09/2021	EXHIBIT 35	306 - 306
2	12/10/2021	EXHIBIT 36	314 - 314
2	12/21/2021	EXHIBIT 37	324 - 324
2	12/21/2021	EXHIBIT 37 (INDEX SHEET) REDDIT'S RESPONSE	323 - 323
2	12/28/2021	EXHIBIT 38 (ADDITION)	393 - 393
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 4	36 - 36
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 5	37 - 37
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 6	38 - 41
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 7	42 - 42
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 8	43 - 54
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT 9	55 - 56
2	12/28/2021	EXHIBIT INDEX EXHIBITS 38-39 (MERGED)	371 - 371

**I N D E X**

<b><u>VOL</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>	<b><u>PLEADING</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NUMBER:</u></b>
1	07/15/2021	EXHIBIT INDEX PAGE	63 - 64
1	11/03/2021	EXHIBIT INDEX PAGE TO OPPOSITION MOTION TO DISMISS	136 - 136
2	12/10/2021	EXHIBIT INDEX SHEET ADDITIONAL EXHIBIT TO SUR- REPLY RE: REPLY RE: DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS	313 - 313
2	01/02/2022	EXHIBIT INDEX SHEET EXHIBITS 40-41	405 - 405
1	12/08/2021	EXHIBIT INDEX SHEET MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SURREPLY/ATTACHED SURREPLY	195 - 196
2	12/28/2021	EXHIBITS 38-39 (MERGED)	372 - 392
2	01/02/2022	EXHIBITS 40-41	406 - 413
1	11/03/2021	FILING FEE REMITTANCE	122 - 123
2	12/27/2021	HEARING REQUESTED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT	357 - 370
1	11/03/2021	LETTER DATED 2/5/2020	141 - 141
1	07/29/2021	MOTION FOR ALTERNATIVE SERVICE HEARING REQUESTED	76 - 80
1	12/08/2021	MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS	177 - 194
2	01/10/2022	MOTION TO VACATE ORDER OF DISMISSAL / MOTION TO STAY ORDER OF DISMISSAL	431 - 439
2	01/06/2022	NOTICE OF APPEAL	421 - 422
2	01/06/2022	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER	423 - 430
1	08/02/2021	NOTICE OF HEARING	81 - 81
1	11/03/2021	NOTICE OF HEARING	121 - 121
2	12/14/2021	NOTICE OF HEARING	317 - 317
2	12/17/2021	NOTICE OF HEARING	322 - 322

**I N D E X**

<b><u>VOL</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>	<b><u>PLEADING</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NUMBER:</u></b>
2	12/28/2021	NOTICE OF HEARING	394 - 394
2	01/10/2022	NOTICE OF HEARING	440 - 440
1	11/03/2021	OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS	124 - 135
2	12/22/2021	OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE FILE SUR-REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND OPPOSITION TO EX PARTE MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE	325 - 333
2	01/24/2022	OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO VACATE ORDER OF DISMISSAL/MOTION TO STAY ORDER OF DISMISSAL AND COUNTERMOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES REQUIRED RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S FRIVOLOUS/ VEXATIOUS FILINGS AND FOR AN INJUNCTION PREVENTING PLAINTIFF FROM FILING FRIVOLOUS FILINGS	443 - 453
2	01/06/2022	ORDER	416 - 420
1	11/03/2021	PROFF OF SERVICE CIVIL SUBPOENA	139 - 140
1	11/03/2021	PROOF OF SERVICE CIVIL SUBPOENA	137 - 138
1	12/03/2021	REPLY RE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS	167 - 176
2	12/23/2021	REPLY RE: DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND OPPOSITION TO EX PARTE MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE	334 - 344
2	12/24/2021	REPLY RE: DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND OPPOSITION TO EX PARTE MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE	346 - 356
2	01/27/2022	REPLY RE: DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO VACATE ORDER OF DISMISSAL/MOTION TO STAY AND OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S COUNTERMOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S "FRIVOLOUS/VEXATIOUS FILINGS" AND FOR AN INJUNCTION PREVENTING PLAINTIFF FROM FILING "FRIVOLOUS FILINGS" 2ND LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT	478 - 480

**I N D E X**

<b><u>VOL</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>	<b><u>PLEADING</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NUMBER:</u></b>
		(CONTINUED)	
3	01/27/2022	REPLY RE: DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO VACATE ORDER OF DISMISSAL/MOTION TO STAY AND OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S COUNTERMOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S "FRIVOLOUS/VEXATIOUS FILINGS" AND FOR AN INJUNCTION PREVENTING PLAINTIFF FROM FILING "FRIVOLOUS FILINGS" 2ND LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT (CONTINUATION)	481 - 488
1	08/30/2021	SCREEN SHOT OF WEB BROWSER	92 - 92
1	10/14/2021	SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM FOR BUSINESS RECORDS (NO APPEARANCE REQUIRED)	93 - 99
1	10/19/2021	SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM FOR BUSINESS RECORDS (NO APPEARANCE REQUIRED)	100 - 106
1	07/16/2021	SUMMONS (ELECTRONICALLY ISSUED)	68 - 71
2	01/26/2022	TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING HELD ON JANUARY 4, 2022	454 - 477
1	08/30/2021	UPDATED EXHIBIT INDEX PAGE (EXHIBITS TO EX-PARTE MOTION)	86 - 86



In this case, Defendant was not only aware that their libelous story would harm Plaintiff's reputation in NV, where she wanted to attend graduate school and build her career, but the nature of the defamatory post would specifically injure her in her intended profession. For example, they specifically accused her of stalking a UNLV professor, demanded said professor to collaborate on a project and frivolously tried to have university administration demotion. This information (if it were true) would be highly relevant to a graduate school admission committee in NV.

Additionally, by directing readers to "read the OP's posts from old to new," they pointed out that Plaintiff was in Las Vegas since her username (Gemini725) is what revealed this fact. (See exhibit 60) There was also the post where Defendant specifically mentioned that Plaintiff was in Las Vegas (in the title) and then shared the libelous post. (See exhibit 13). Thus, for this reason and all other arguments presented throughout this case, it is both reasonable and proper for NV to have personal jurisdiction over Defendant. There is no doubt that Plaintiff's injuries physically occurred in NV, harmed her reputation and caused her embarrassment exclusively in NV, and that Defendant knew he was causing this harm in NV and that Plaintiff was not interested in attending other graduate programs, etc. This case very much parallels *Calder vs. Jones* except that it happened on social media instead of in print and that Plaintiff, instead of being a celebrity, needed a "good" reputation to get into graduate school in NV.

#### **NRCP 60(b)**

Next, Defendant, through their attorney, points out that "Motions under Rule 60 (b) are addressed to the sound discretion by the trial court in granting or denying such motions is not to be disturbed on appeal absent **abuse of discretion**" (emphasis defendant's) They, through their attorney, cite several cases where abuse of discretion was not found. In *Heard vs. Fisher's Cobb Sales*, for example, the parties had tried for over ten months to reach a settlement, but appellant was put on notice a number of times that respondent was still pursuing judgment against him if a satisfactory settlement agreement was not reached. (502 P 2nd 104 (Nev 1972) 502 P. 2d 104) This is dissimilar to this case where Plaintiff has been prompt in her filings and diligent in conforming to Court rules and procedures to the best of her ability.

In *Ogle vs. Miller*, it was stated that "In addition to showing excusable neglect, the movant must demonstrate that he has a meritorious defense to the action." This case involved setting aside a default judgment, but if we compare Plaintiff's case to *Ogle*, and assume that to reinstate a dismissed case, it must be reasonably able to succeed on the merits, Plaintiff would meet that criteria. She has provided numerous exhibits demonstrating the falsity of Defendant's defamatory allegations, medical records confirming her emotional distress, anxiety disorder, etc. In *Ogle*, the Court said that "It would have been a clear abuse of discretion to permit a judgment of this nature to stand and therefore deny the party against whom it is entered their day in Court." (491 P. 2d 40 (Nev. 1971) 491 P.2d 40) In Plaintiff's case, she suffered considerable reputational and emotional injury by Defendant, and by the case being Dismissed, is being denied her day in court.

In their Opposition to Motion to Vacate/Motion to Stay Order (of Dismissal), Defendant, through their attorney, also argues that errors cited by Plaintiff in the Order and Order and Entry did not amount to abuse of discretion. (See Opposition to Motion to Vacate Order of Dismissal/Motion to Stay Order of Dismissal pgs. 4-5) However, they only focus on the “misnaming” of Plaintiff and ignore all the other examples Plaintiff cited. First, mistaking the Plaintiff for the Defendant in a motion to dismiss is pretty significant. This is not the same as a slight misspelling where it is still clear who they’re referring. The Order of Entry says that it is Plaintiff’s Motion to Dismiss. Obviously, Plaintiff knows that she did not file a motion to dismiss her own case, but it conveys a very different meaning on the record. Even if, for arguments, sake, however, the Court attributes this to clerical error, Defendant did not address the other errors Plaintiff cited such as the order not specifying whether the motion (to Dismiss) was granted with or without prejudice or whether it was granted in part or in full, that it failed to even stipulate what the order was for, etc. (See Motion to Vacate Order of Dismissal/Motion to Stay Order of Dismissal. p 2). The totality of these errors reflect haste and/or carelessness, which signifies that the decision (to dismiss the case) was made hastily and arbitrarily as well.

Furthermore, at the hearing itself, Plaintiff was given less time to speak than Defendant’s counsel, was cut off by the judge and rudely told that she had “had her day,” thereby preventing her from responding to one of Defendant’s allegations. (Not to mention that she has not “had her day” in Court; a dismissal, by definition, denies that.) While Plaintiff was asked whether the police she contacted against Defendant were in the UK, she was not asked further “questions about Defendant’s location.” It was a perfunctory question, and the nuances of this particular case were not considered. For example, Defendant was not a UK citizen, consistently living in the UK. As stated throughout the case, Defendant retained his US citizenship while in the UK, voted in US elections (which gave the US jurisdiction over him), caused his injury on a US owned social media site, moved constantly, and furthermore, was not even living in the UK when the suit was filed against him (the UK no longer had jurisdiction over him when this suit was filed). Defendant also travels a lot, and it is likely, based on their travel history, that they have visited NV at some point. But even if that were incorrect, this Court would still have jurisdiction over them.

Defendant’s motion to dismiss, however, did not exclusively focus on jurisdiction. They also claimed that Plaintiff had failed to state claims and that Defendant’s defamation was “protected speech.” As such, Plaintiff spent time addressing those issues at the hearing, only for her arguments to be deemed irrelevant, and this took time away from further addressing jurisdiction. Plaintiff was also concerned that her case was heard by a temporary judge instead of by District 3’s current judge, the honorable Monica Trujillo (a concern which she expressed to Department 3’s law clerk). While she understands that the timing of these hearings coincide with Judge Trujillo’s absence, she expects any temporary judge to give her case sufficient attention and diligence, but that was not the case at the Jan. 4th hearing.

### **NRCP 60(b)(3)**

Defendant's counsel, further states: Essentially, Plaintiff attempts to state that the Defendant's quoting from Plaintiff's own filings and pleadings are misrepresentations because they don't help her case and seeks vacating the order on such a basis under NRCP 60 (b)(3). (Opposition to Motion to Vacate Motion to Dismiss p.5) In the previous sentence he quotes Plaintiff saying, "Defendant's attorney...claimed that Defendant asked Reddit, " I'm being harassed by Plaintiff, what do I do?" (Id at pg. 2). At the Jan. 4th hearing, as Plaintiff stated in her Motion to Vacate Order (of Dismissal), Defendant's counsel tried to make it appear that Plaintiff was harassing Defendant and that Defendant was asking Reddit for advice. In reality, however, Defendant's Counsel knew that Plaintiff was referring to exhibit 13, where Defendant was asking Reddit: *Received a message from the South Yorkshire Police informing me about apparent harassment of a woman from Las Vegas on Reddit, what does this mean and what do I do?* This was when Defendant was **contacted by the police about their harassment against Plaintiff** (after which they continued harassing her).

This was not his only "misrepresentation" to the Court, however. As stated in the Motion to Vacate and Motion to File Sur-Reply, Defendant's counsel also accused Plaintiff of being unsure if she was suing the right person, of admitting to harassing UNLV employees and faculty, of being uncertain as to whether officials at UNLV and UNR saw the defamatory content, and that her argument for jurisdiction was merely that she was present in NV when she read the defamatory content. (See Motion to Vacate p. 3 and Motion to File Sur-Reply pgs.1-2)

Throughout this case Defendant, through their counsel, has attempted to mislead the Court in ways that would prejudice the case against Plaintiff and paint her in a false/negative light. This alone merits vacating the judgment under NRCP 60(b)(3).

### **Standard Regarding Frivolous Motions (Plaintiff's Reply)**

Defendant claims that Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate Order of Dismissal is Frivolous as defined by Nevada law, which defines a frivolous claim as one "not well grounded in fact and warranted either by existing law or by a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law." *Simonean v. U. and Community College Systems of Nevada* 122 Nev. 187, 196, 128 P. d 1057, 1063 (200).

Plaintiff filed her motion to vacate on Jan. 10th, before paying either the \$250 supreme court filing fee or the \$500 cost on appeal bond (which have both since been paid). This would still give the District Court jurisdiction to hear the case on February 22, 2022, and therefore it is not a frivolous motion. Moreover, Plaintiff made the motion in good faith and based on sound legal arguments. Defendant not wanting the case to be reinstated does not make the motion "frivolous."

**NRAP 8 (a)(1)**

Defendant, through their attorney, cites NRAP 8 (a)(1) also claims that the motion to stay was "frivolous." (See Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate Order of Dismissal) An Order of Dismissal is still an order, and if the motion to vacate the dismissal is not granted in the District Court, Plaintiff wants the order "stayed" while pending appeal so it can be referred back to the District Court.

**OPPOSITION TO COUNTERMOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES REQUIRED TO RESPOND  
TO PLAINTIFF'S "FRIVOLOUS/VEXATIOUS FILINGS" AND FOR AN INJUNCTION  
PREVENTING PLAINTIFF FROM FILING "FRIVOLOUS FILINGS"**

Plaintiff again reminds this Court that this lawsuit was brought on entirely by Defendant's tortious conduct against Plaintiff. Again, Defendant should have thought about the costs of litigation before defaming and harassing her. They even kept their defamatory post up on SRD, continued sharing it, and continued harassing Plaintiff, not only despite a police warning to stop this behavior, but knowing that Plaintiff planned to sue them. (See exhibits 13, 8, and 20). That they're requesting Plaintiff to pay their attorney fees after all the financial and emotional damage they've caused her is itself further harassment and abuse.

Every motion Plaintiff has filed has been called "frivolous" by Defendant, and they even tried to preemptively prevent her from filing any motion beyond her original opposition. (See Reply Re: Motion to Dismiss p. 9) However, each motion made was necessary based on Defendant's actions, through their attorney. For example, in their reply re: opposition to motion to dismiss, they made several false statements and brought up new issues which required a further response by Plaintiff. (See Motion to File Sur-Reply). When Plaintiff attempted to respond to those issues and falsehoods, they claimed the motion was "frivolous" and requested attorney fees (though they did not file the proper motion for them). Plaintiff had also experienced a medical issue and asked Defendant's counsel for a joint stipulation and order to postpone the January 4th hearing, but they refused. So, Plaintiff then had to file an ex parte motion for continuance (see Ex Parte Motion for Continuance). This too was deemed "frivolous" by Defendant. (See Opposition to Sur Reply and Ex Parte Motion For Continuance pgs. 1-9) Now the pattern repeats. Essentially, Defendant, through their attorney, tries to shut down any action Plaintiff takes in support of her case.

In Defendant's Countermotion for Attorney Fees, p7 Defendant's Counsel also wrote that Plaintiff has filed "60-70 bogus filings." Most of these filings, however, were exhibits necessary to counter Defendant's false statements and accusations. For example, Defendant, through their attorney, accused Plaintiff of being unsure whether it was Defendant who caused me harm (see Opposition, p. 2) Thus, Defendant had to add multiple exhibits to demonstrate with certainty that

Defendant is the same Peter Cooper who caused her injuries. This, of course, is obvious given that Defendant accepted service of the complaint and hired an attorney to defend the case, but Plaintiff did not want to leave any room for this Court to doubt her certainty. Similarly, Plaintiff added exhibits of her medical records to show that she had indeed suffered from the symptoms mentioned in the Leave to File Sur-Reply (see Motion for Sur-Reply p.2, exhibit 21) which caused a delay in submitted other pertinent exhibits. These exhibits were added because Defendant, through their attorney, was asserting that Plaintiff had failed to state claims based on the "truth" of Defendant's allegations. For example, they had even cited NRS 200.575 (See Motion to Dismiss p. 7); Normally, evidence is gathered during the discovery process, but since Defendant was trying to have the case dismissed before a trial date was even set, Plaintiff needed to provide as much evidence as possible that the Defendant's allegations were indeed false and defamatory. So, she added a police statement from UNLV proving that they had no records on her, which obviously shows that she did not stalk Dr. Gallo (or police services would have been involved).

These are just a few examples, but every filing and exhibit Plaintiff has filed has been in good faith and in an attempt to prove the merits of her case and has been made on sound legal ground. Defendant, through their attorney, has repeatedly lied to this Court, and each time Plaintiff proves the falsity of these statements/allegations, she is called "vexations," and the documents filed "bogus" etc.

Defendant has not only asked for attorney fees, but for an injunction preventing Plaintiff from filing "frivolous" filings. (And it is clear based on the history of their filings, that by "frivolous," they mean any filing submitted by Plaintiff.) In support of this argument they cite *Peck vs. Crouser*, in which the Court defined a "vexatious litigant" (as defined by Black Law's Dictionary 952, 8th edition) as "one who repeatedly files frivolous lawsuits." This, as Plaintiff's casefile and any record search on her will show, is the first lawsuit that she has ever filed; that hardly defines a "vexatious litigant." It is also obviously not a frivolous lawsuit, Plaintiff suffered significant damages, both economic and emotional, because of Defendant's tortious conduct.

In their Countermotion for Attorneys' Fees Required to Respond to Plaintiff's "Frivolous/Vexatious Filings" and for an Injunction Preventing Plaintiff From Filing "Frivolous Filings," Defendant, through their attorney states that "Plaintiff blames everyone in the case—defendant, counsel, the Court, Reddit, unknown individuals online, UNLV, etc.-except herself for her problems." It is, however, Defendant, who is blaming Plaintiff for pursuing a lawsuit against them after they defamed, humiliated, and harassed her. They clearly want to not only avoid accountability for the severe harm they've caused her but expect to be defended by counsel at no cost. As Plaintiff said in her Reply Re: Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to File Sur-Reply, Defendant not only chose to engage in his tortious conduct but agreed to his attorney's fees in exchange for his representation. If they are unsatisfied with or do not wish to pay those fees, that is an issue between them and their attorney. It is certainly not Plaintiff's responsibility to pay for Defendant's counsel. Maybe next time Defendant wishes to engage in similar torts against her, or anyone for that matter, they will think about the cost of litigation. If

the Court grants Defendant's motion, however, they will only encourage Defendant to repeat or engage in similar behavior in the future.

### **SECOND LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT**

Pursuant to NRCP 15(a)(2), if not amended within 21 days of either a responsive pleading or service of motion 12 (b) (e) or (f), a party may "amend its pleading only with the opposing party's written consent or the court's leave. The court should freely give leave when justice so requires." Also, "An amendment to a pleading relates back to the date of the original pleading when:(1) the amendment asserts a claim or defense that arose out of the conduct, transaction, or occurrence set out-or attempted to be set out- in the original pleading." (NRCP C[1])

Much to the Defendant's dismay, Reddit removed their libelous SRD post on Jan. 11, 2022. Thus, Plaintiff no longer requires an injunction from this court to remove it. Instead, she is now asking for an injunction preventing Defendant from reposting/retyping or further publishing it in any way.

This should not affect Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate the Dismissal. That defamatory post remained up from Dec. 16, 2019-Jan. 11, 2022, and has already caused Plaintiff significant damages. For example, she was already rejected from UNR because of it. Also, every person (all either in or having substantial connections to NV) whom it would have embarrassed her to have seen it, has already seen it. Plaintiff is also still traumatized from not only Defendant's harassment but that which they incited against her. Furthermore, one's reputation is not immediately restored just because Reddit deletes a post. Winning a lawsuit on the merits is what restores one's reputation, and Defendant still needs to compensate Plaintiff for the damages already sustained.

Should the dismissal be reversed, Plaintiff will need to amend the complaint to incorporate this new information, and she wanted to inform the Court about it early on.

### **CONCLUSION**

Plaintiff filed this lawsuit because Defendant, for no reason other than to inflict emotional distress on her, published a defamatory post on subredditdrama, a popular subsection of Reddit, a US owned social media Platform. As stated throughout all papers on file throughout this suit, this post accused Plaintiff of stalking a UNLV professor, trying to force this professor, Dr. Marica Gallo, to collaborate on a project, and then made frivolous complaints to UNLV administrators in an attempt to get them demoted.

This post somehow got back to UNLV, and they sent Plaintiff a cease and desist letter, which in turn prevented her from having letters of recommendation from her upper division UNLV professors—as most graduate applicants have. She was subsequently rejected from the University of Nevada Reno, and was told by Dr. Linda Curcio-Nagy, UNR History Professor and

Associate Dean of their Liberal Arts College, that not having letters from upper division professors was a significant red flag in her application. (See Leave to file Sur-Reply p.8) Furthermore, at the time of creating their libelous post re: Plaintiff, Defendant knew that Plaintiff wanted to attend graduate school, hoped to have an academic career, and only wanted to pursue graduate school and build her career in NV. (They even mentioned this in the libelous post.)

Defendant then continued harassing her, including making repeated, unwanted contact with her, despite numerous attempts by her to stop it (i.e. changing accounts etc.). She even contacted the police, and the harassment continued after the police warned Defendant to stop. Defendant had moved during the period and before long was posting about moving back to the US.

On July 15, 2021, Plaintiff filed her lawsuit against Defendant in this Court, and after suffering nearly two years worth of damages and investing considerable time, effort, and money into this case, it was erroneously dismissed on July 4th, 2022. As stated above, the numerous significant errors in the Order and Order and Entry (and detailed above) reflect that the decision to grant the dismissal was made arbitrarily and hastily. For example, The Court failed to properly apply *Calder* which allows states to have jurisdiction over nonresidents when a defendant's intentional torts intend to cause damage in the forum state. This was even pointed out in a NV Court case (E'Cassanova) which pointed that the *Walden vs. Fiore* Court explained that the key to *Calder* was "reputational effects." (See pg 3 above). This points to abuse of discretion, which is reason to vacate the order under NRCP 60(b).

Additionally, Defendant, through their attorney, has made repeated "misrepresentations" to this Court—misrepresentations that prejudice Plaintiff. (See motion to Vacate p.3, Motion for Leave to File Sur-Reply p. 1-4, and p.6 above) The "misrepresentations" have been so egregious that they rise to the level of misconduct. For example, Defendant, through their attorney, accused Plaintiff of not knowing if she was suing the right person and had even accused Plaintiff of harassing Defendant when Defendant was the one who was issued a police warning to stop harassing Plaintiff. (See transcript p. 21.). The Defendant, through their attorney, also accused her of not knowing whether anyone at UNLV actually saw the post, etc. Thus NRCP (60)(b)(3) also gives this Court grounds to Vacate the Order of Dismissal, as it states that "the district court may provide relief from a final judgment or order for reasons of fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party." An Order to Dismiss is still an Order, and defendant's counsel's misrepresentations alone would give this Court grounds to vacate the dismissal.

Furthermore, Defendant's falsehoods and "misrepresentations" have forced Plaintiff to file responses to them, and when she does, Defendant (through their attorney) attempts to portray her as a "vexatious litigant." They even—after all their intentional torts against her—expect her to pay their attorney fees. This itself is further harassment against her by Defendant, as is evident by the fact that they, through their attorney, even tried to preemptively have her filings stricken (See Reply Re: Opposition to Motion to Dismiss p. 9). This further shows that they are guilty of

lying to the Court. They would not be worried about Plaintiff filing additional responses if they didn't know that they their "misrepresentations" would create a need for further filings.

For the reasons stated above and in all papers and pleadings on file, and any oral argument this Court may allow at the time of hearing, Plaintiff requests that her **Motion Vacate Order of Dismissal and/or Order to Stay Order of dismissal** be **GRANTED** and **Defendant's Countermotion For Attorney Fees and Injunction to Prevent Further "Frivolous" Filings** be **DENIED**. Plaintiff also asks for another leave to amend her complaint to add that Reddit removed the Defamatory post on Jan. 11, 2022 and that she now needs an injunction to prevent Defendant from reposting it rather than an injunction for it to be removed.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the state of NV that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/Lisa Breslaw

Lisa Breslaw  
Plaintiff, In Proper Person  
7050 Shady Palms St.  
Las Vegas, NV 89131  
702-488-6989  
[lisa.breslaw@alumni.unlv.edu](mailto:lisa.breslaw@alumni.unlv.edu)

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 27, 2022, I electronically transmitted the above PLAINTIFF'S  
REPLY RE: DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO VACATE/MOTION TO STAY,  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S COUNTERMOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES/INJUNCTION  
TO PREVENT FURTHER "FRIVOLOUS" FILINGS and SECOND LEAVE TO AMEND  
COMPLAINT through the electronic filing system of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State  
of Nevada, pursuant to Nevada Electronic Filing and Conversion Rules upon the following:

Sagar Raich, Esq.  
NEVADA BAR No. 13229  
6785 S. Eastern Ave. STe. 5  
Las Vegas, NV 89119  
Telephone (702)758-4240  
Facsimile: (702) 998-6930  
Email: [sraich@raichattorneys.com](mailto:sraich@raichattorneys.com)  
Attorney for Defendant, Peter Cooper



**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Intentional Misconduct**

**COURT MINUTES**

**August 31, 2021**

---

A-21-837948-C	Lisa Breslaw, Plaintiff(s)
	vs.
	Peter Cooper, Defendant(s)

---

**August 31, 2021      9:00 AM      Motion**

**HEARD BY:** Trujillo, Monica **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 11C

**COURT CLERK:** Grecia Snow

**RECORDER:** Rebeca Gomez

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES**

**PRESENT:**      Breslaw, Lisa D. Petitioner

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Court NOTED it did not have a chance to review the exhibits and would issue a minute order with it's decision. Argument by Ms. Breslaw to serve Deft. on the Reddit platform. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED to chambers for decision.

CONTINUED TO: 9/30/21 (CHAMBERS)

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Intentional Misconduct**

**COURT MINUTES**

**September 30, 2021**

---

A-21-837948-C      Lisa Breslaw, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
Peter Cooper, Defendant(s)

---

**September 30, 2021      3:00 AM      Motion**

**HEARD BY:** Trujillo, Monica      **COURTROOM:** Chambers

**COURT CLERK:** Grecia Snow

**RECORDER:**

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES  
PRESENT:**

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Plaintiff s Motion for Alternative Service of Process came before the Court on the September 27, 2021 Chamber Calendar. After reviewing the Motion, affidavits, and all of the filed exhibits, the Court FINDS that Plaintiff has not met the requirements under NRCP 4.4. The attached Exhibits are insufficient to establish that Defendant is associated with the alleged social media accounts. Furthermore, Plaintiff has failed to confirm that Defendant s last known address was, in fact, his last known address. Finally, the Affidavit of Due Diligence filed on July 29, 2021 acknowledges there was no response from the Defendant on the Reddit account. Therefore, COURT ORDERED, Plaintiff s Motion for Alternative Service of Process is DENIED. Plaintiff to prepare and Order and submit the same to Chambers.

CLERKS NOTE: This Minute Order was electronically served by Courtroom Clerk, Grecia Snow, to all registered parties for Odyssey File & Serve. 9/30/21 gs

**DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Intentional Misconduct**

**COURT MINUTES**

**January 04, 2022**

---

A-21-837948-C      Lisa Breslaw, Plaintiff(s)  
vs.  
Peter Cooper, Defendant(s)

---

**January 04, 2022      9:00 AM      Motion to Dismiss**

**HEARD BY:** Barker, David      **COURTROOM:** RJC Courtroom 11C

**COURT CLERK:** Grecia Snow

**RECORDER:** Rebeca Gomez

**REPORTER:**

**PARTIES**

**PRESENT:**      Breslaw, Lisa D.      Petitioner  
Raich, Sagar R.      Attorney

**JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Court NOTED it reviewed all filed pleadings. Following arguments by counsel, COURT FINDS good cause under 12(b)(2), therefore, ORDERED, motion GRANTED WITHOUT PREJUDICE; pending hearings VACATED. Mr. Raich to prepare the Order.

CLERK'S NOTE: Subsequent to the hearing, Court clarified the motion was granted without prejudice. 1/18/22 gs

# Certification of Copy and Transmittal of Record

State of Nevada }  
County of Clark } SS:

Pursuant to the Supreme Court order dated January 21, 2022, I, Steven D. Grierson, the Clerk of the Court of the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of the complete trial court record for the case referenced below. The record comprises three volumes with pages numbered 1 through 491.

LISA BRESLAW,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

PETER COOPER,

Defendant(s),

Case No: A-21-837948-C

Dept. No: III

now on file and of record in this office.

**IN WITNESS THEREOF**, I have hereunto  
Set my hand and Affixed the seal of the  
Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada  
This 2 day of February 2022.

Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court



Amanda Hampton, Deputy Clerk