

1
2 **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

3 HENRY E. GAAR,
4 Respondent,

5 vs.

6 TRAKETRA DANIELS,
7 Appellant.

Supreme Court Case No. 2021-00021
Electronically Filed
May 02 2022 09:47 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

8
9 **APPELLANT'S CASE APPEAL STATEMENT**

10 Appellant: Jennifer Isso, Esq.

11 Judge: Arthur Ritchie

12 Appellant:

13 JENNIFER ISSO, ESQ.
14 Nevada Bar No. 13157
15 8965 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 120
16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
ji@issohugheslaw.com

17 Respondent: Henry E. Gaar's Counsel

18 RACHEL JACOBSON, ESQ.
19 64 N. Pecos Road #200
Henderson, NV 89074

20 Appellant's attorney Licensed in Nevada: Yes

21 Respondent's attorney licensed in Nevada: Yes

22 Has Appellant, Jennifer Isso, Esq., ever been represented by counsel in District

23 Court: No

24 Appellant, Jennifer Isso, Esq., Represented by Appointed counsel on appeal?

25 No
26
27
28

Appellant, Jennifer Isso, Esq., Granted Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis:

No

Appellant filed Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis: No

Date Commenced in District Court: The case was originally opened on 6/19/2020. However, the issue on appeal pertains to the hearing held on 4/12/22 regarding the Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Jay Young's Report and Recommendation, which then was adopted. The order was signed and entered on 4/12/22.

Brief Description of the Nature of the Action: SANCTIONS against Counsel, Jennifer Isso, Esq., by Discovery Commissioner Jay Young.

Previous Appeal? No

Case involves Child Custody and/or visitation: Underlying case, Yes. However, not the issues on Appeal.

Appeal involves Child Custody and/or Visitation: No

Possibility of Settlement? No

Provide a Brief Description of the Nature of the Action and Result, including the type of judgement or order being appealed and the relief granted by the District Court. In this highly contentious custody, Respondent reopened the case after a stipulated decree was signed and entered on January 19, 2021 where the parties agreed to share Joint Legal and Joint Physical Custody. Respondent's counsel

sought discovery on information that was irrelevant and not proportional to the needs of the case. Counsel, Isso and her client however provided hundreds of pages of information. Respondent's counsel then filed a motion to compel which was granted on order shorten time. Ms. Isso explained at the hearing that there was no meet and confer and raised other objections. Respondent's counsel and Discovery Commissioner Jay Young also engaged in ex-parte communications prior to the hearing where Respondent's counsel emailed deposition audio recordings to the Discovery Commissioner and intentionally did not provide these to Ms. Isso. Ms. Isso did not have the audio recordings and had never listened to them. Discovery Commissioner Jay Young used the information he obtained through ex-parte communications from Respondent's counsel and then proceeded to sanction Ms. Isso \$1500 in front of numerous other attorneys waiting on bluejeans, humiliating her and ruining the relationship between her and her client. The Discovery Commissioner then ordered that certain tasks are completed prior to the time lapsing for when she can file an objection to his report and recommendation. Ms. Isso filed an objection to the report and recommendation. At the hearing on the objection, Judge Ritchie seemed ill prepared and did not ask a single question or make any inquiry and he outright affirmed and adopted the report and recommendation.

Dated this 2nd day of May, 2022.

1 /s/ JENNIFER ISSO, Esq.

2
3 JENNIFER ISSO, ESQ.

4
5
6 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

7 I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that on the 2nd day of May, 2022, a true
8 and correct copy of the foregoing Case Appeal Statement was emailed to the
9 following:

10
11 RACHEL JACOBSON ESQ.
12 reli@jacobsonlawltd.com

13 /s/ Jennifer Isso

14 An employee of
15 Isso & Hughes Law
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28