IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN
POLICE DEPARTMENT; AND
CANNON COCHRAN MANAGEMENT
SERVICES, INC.,

Supreme Court Case Ne estromically Filed
Mar 03 2022 11:32 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
District Court Case No est No e

Appellants,

٧.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

25

26

STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT
OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY,
DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS; AND STATE OF
NEVADA BOARD FOR THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE
SUBSEQUENT INJURY ACCOUNT
FOR SELF-INSURED EMPLOYERS,

Respondents.

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ.
L. MICHAEL FRIEND, ESQ.
LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD &
SMITH LLP
2300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 900, Box 28
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102-4375
Attorneys for Appellants

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

and Cannon Cochran Management

CHRISTOPHER ECCLES, ESQ. STATE OF NEVADA DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS 3360 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 250 Las Vegas, NV 89102

24 Services, Inc.

AARON D. FORD, ESQ. DONALD J. BORDELOVE, ESQ. STATE OF NEVADA OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 555 E. Washington Ave., #3900 Las Vegas, NV 89101

LEWIS 8
BRISBOIS
BISGAARD
& SMITH LLP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	Pag	ge
3	TABLE OF CONTENTSi	
4	TABLE OF AUTHORITIESii	
5	I. REPLY1-3	
6	II. CONCLUSION3-4	
7 8	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE5-6	
9	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING7	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21 22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
30		

LEWIS⁸ BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

2	Statutes				Page No(s).
3	NRS 233B.131				1.2.3
4		•••••	•••••••••	••••••	1, 2, 3
5	5				
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18 19					
20					
21	* I I				
22	II .				
23					
24					
25					
26	II.				
27	11				
28	III				

LEWIS⁸
BRISBOIS
BISGAARD
& SMITH ILP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

4863-5839-6946.1

ii

LEWIS⁸
BRISBOIS
BISGAARD
& SMITH LIP

REPLY

Appellants believe the district court's dismissal of its petition was an abuse of discretion based on erroneous interpretation of NRS 233B.131(1). Specifically, there is no basis in the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act to dismiss a petition for judicial review for failure to comply with NRS 233B.131(1). The requirements under that statute are not mandatory such that failure to comply would result in such a severe sanction as denying the appealing party its due process. This punishment is made even more egregious because the facts show that Appellants detrimentally relied upon the statements and actions of the AG and DIR, the very parties now advocating dismissal, based upon that reliance.

NRS 233B.131(1) requires two things, yet the legislature references twice the permissive nature of the requirements (twice in a section consisting of a mere 142 words), beginning by noting transmittal of the record of proceedings may be made within 45 days or "such time as allowed by the court" and concluding that the court "may require or permit subsequent corrections or additions to the record." This is not mandatory language, certainly not definitive enough to lead to the harshest sanction of having an appeal dismissed outright.

///

///

Appellants believe that the phrase "shall" as used in NRS 233B.131(1) is only presumptively mandatory in this situation. DIR and AG counter by stating that because no record had been submitted, there was no basis for the District Court to permit corrections or additions to the record as allowed by statute. In point of fact, there was a record submitted—the one submitted by the DIR and AG on November 9, 2020. The AG stated the "entire record of the proceedings under review by this Court" were filed "[p]ursuant to NRS 233B.131" and the DIR certified that the "documents submitted herewith comprise the record of the administrative proceeding." (APP at 157.) There is absolutely a record that could have been corrected or added to if the court found it necessary.

DIR and AG also apparently take issue with the fact that Appellants' Opening Brief "lacked citations to the transcript of the underlying administrative proceeding." Respondent Brief at 4:13-14. There is no requirement that a party cite to the transcript of the underlying proceedings. The record submitted by the DIR and AG provided ample documentary evidence to support Appellants' legal position in the underlying matter.

The punishment in this situation is made even more harsh by the fact that the two administrative agencies operating under the NIIA do not apply NRS 233B.131 the same way in practice. Despite DIR's contention that the language of NRS 233B.131 is plain and unambiguous, the DIR does not transmit the transcript of the

proceedings in a judicial review proceeding, yet the Hearings Division does. We have two administrative agencies under the penumbra of the State of Nevada's executive branch who apparently approach the requirements of NRS 233B.131(1) differently. Appellants' reliance upon those governing administrative agencies to its detriment substantially prejudices its rights, especially considering the grave consequence of an outright dismissal of the appeal.

II.

CONCLUSION

Appellants do not dispute that they did not file the transcript within 45 days of service of their petition per NRS 233B.131(1). However, Appellants argue that this omission is not jurisdictional and does not mandate dismissal, nor was good cause the proper standard of review. In support of this position, Appellants posit they relied upon certifications and representations made by Respondents that the entire record had been transmitted to the district court; that equitable remedies forestall dismissal; and that public policy supports hearing this case on the merits.

Based upon the foregoing, Appellants respectfully request this court to reverse the district court's order dismissing their petition and remand for the petition to continue on its merits.

Dated this 2 day of March, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

LEWIS, BRISBOIS, BISGAARD & SMITH, LLP

DANIEL L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 005125

L. MICHAEL FRIEND, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 011131

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

2300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 900, Box 28

Las Vegas, Nevada 89102-4375

Attorneys for Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

- 1. I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in Times New Roman font size 14.
- 2. I further certify that this brief complies with the type-volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7)(A)(ii) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by NRAP 32(a)(7)(C), it is proportionally spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more, and contains 637 words and 52 lines of text.
- 3. Finally, I hereby certify that I have read this appellate brief, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I further certify that this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e)(1), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by a reference to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or Appendix where the matter relied on is to be found.

LEWIS 8 BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

4. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Respectfully submitted,

LEWIS, BRISBOIS, BISGAARD & SMITH, LLP

L. MICHAEL FRIEND, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 11131

2300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 900, Box 28

Las Vegas, Nevada 89102-4375

Attorneys for Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 5(b), I hereby certify that, on 2 the 3 day of March, 2022, service of the attached APPELLANTS' REPLY 3 **BRIEF** was made this date by depositing a true copy of the same for mailing, first 4 5 class mail, and/or electronic service as follows: Christopher Eccles, Esq. DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS Workers' Compensation Section 3360 W. Sahara Avenue, Ste. 250 Las Vegas, NV 89102 10 Industrial Relations (DIR) Division Headquarters 11 400 West King Street, Suite 400 12 Carson City, Nevada 89703 Bernadine Welsh 13 LVMPD – Health Detail 400 South Martin L. King Blvd., Building B 15 | Las Vegas, NV 89106-4372 16 Gabriela Diaz, Claim Representative CANNON COCHRAN 17 MANAGEMENT SERVICES, 18 INC. P. O. Box 35350 Las Vegas, NV 89133-5350 19 20 21 22

An employee of LEWIS, BRISBOIS, BISGAARD & SMITH, LLP

26

23

24

25

1

27

BRISBOIS
BISGAARD
& SMITH LLP

4863-5839-6946.1