1	SHIP DEFENDING THE HERE
2	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
3	
4	JEFFREY A. MYERS and ANDREW JAMES) No. 85441
5	Appellants,
6	vs.
7	THI OF NEVADA AT CHEYENNE, LLC; HEALTHCARE REALTY OF CHEYENNE,
8	LLC; FUNDAMENTAL ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, LLC
9	Respondents.
10	
11	
12	NRAP RULE 26.1. DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
13	Appellants are individuals suing in their individual capacity. The sole
14	attorney who has, or will, appear on the Appellants' behalf is DONALD C.
15	KUDLER, ESQ., who is a partner in the Law Office of CAP & KUDLER.
16	
17	DATED this 57 day of April, 2023.
18	CAP & KUDLER
19	1/2/1/
20	By: Donald C Kudler, Esq.
21	Nevada Bar No. 005041
22	3202 W. Charleston, Blvd.
23	Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Attorney for Appellants
24	Jeffrey A. Myers and Andrew James
25	Anarew James
26	
27	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	<u>1</u>	Page
3	NRAP RULE 26.1. DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	1
4	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	3
5	Cases Cited.	3
6	Statutes Cited	
7	STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL	4
8	ARGUMENT	5
9	CONCLUSION	7
10	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	8
11	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	10
12		
13		
14		
15		,
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	-2-	

1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2	
3	Cases Cited
4	1. Town & Country Elec. Co. v. Hawke, 100 Nev. 701, 692 P.2d 490 (1984)
5	100 Nev. 701, 092 1.24 490 (1964)
6	Statutes Cited
7	N/A
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
2627	
28	-3-

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

- 1. Did the Jury Err in finding that the Defendants did not Breach any duty of care owed to the Plaintiffs?
- 2. Did the District Court err by denying the Plaintiffs' Motion for New Trial?
 - 3. Did the District Court error by not following the law of the case?

.

ARGUMENT

The Defendants' argument breaks down to a claim that there are other possibilities for the Jury to have concluded that they did not breach any duty owed to the Plaintiffs based on the holding in *Town & Country Elec. Co. v. Hawke*, 100 Nev. 701, 692 P.2d 490 (1984). They argue that perhaps the Jury Didn't believe the Plaintiffs or their experts, or that the Jury could have fund that the Plaintiffs caused their own injury, or that the arc flash was caused by the Plaintiffs. Whether or not the Plaintiffs caused their own injuries or they caused the arc flash, or if the Defendants failure to maintain the breaker affect the issue in this case: did the Jury err in determining that the Defendants breached a duty to the Plaintiffs and others to maintain their property, including the main breaker.

The Defendant's duty to maintain their property is clear from Jury Instructions 22, 27, 28, and 29 (See bates nos., AA000038 through AA000041). This is supported by the testimony cited on pages 9 - 11 of the Appellants' Opening Brief. If the Jury held that the Defendants owed no duty to the Plaintiffs, then they manifestly disregarded the Jury Instructions. Likewise as shown on pages 11 - 18 of the Appellants' Opening Brief, the evidence is clear, including that of the Defendants' employee, Roy Comstock, that the Defendants did not perform the maintenance required to maintain a safe property.

Lastly, as noted on pages 18 - 22 of the Appellants' Opening Brief the testimony all shows that the main breaker failed causing the arc flash. The Defendants have pointed to the testimony of their employee, Roy Comstock in their Answering Brief. However, as cited elsewhere, his testimony supports the Plaintiffs' position in regards to the failure of the Breaker to Trip. Specifically, Mr. Comstock testified, at AA000839, Line 19 to AA000840, Line 1:

26 | . . .

Q. Thank you. Mr. Comstock, the night of the incident on June 6th, 2014, 1 you got there the next Monday? 2 A. Yes, sir. 3 Q. Anybody report to you that the power went out to the building? 4 A. No, sir. 5 6 Q. Anybody report to you that the generator kicked on? A. No. sir. 7 8 As an aside, the Defendants are confusing two breakers as discussed in the 9 Opening Brief: the one being replaced by the Plaintiffs at the time of the incident 10 which did not fail and cause the arc flash; and the main breaker that failed to trip 11 when the short occurred as the screw the Defendants were responsible for fell from 12 above the Plaintiffs' heads. Here, it was the main breaker that failed - a breaker, like 13 all other equipment in the building that was only looked at when there was an 14 issue¹. 15 Q. Do you know whether or not there were any regular inspection of those 16 panels by a licensed electrician? 17 A. No. Just a licensed electrician if there's a problem. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 See, i.e., Roy Comstock's Testimony at AA000834, lines 6 - 8: 27 28 -6-

CONCLUSION

Appellants' respectfully requests that this Court reverse the Orders of the District Court denying the Motion for New Trial and order that a New Trial against all Defendants on the Merits go forth.

DATED this _____day of April, 2023.

CAP & KUDLER

By:

Donald C Kudler, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 005041 3202 W. Charleston, Blvd. Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 (702) 878-8778

Attorney for Appellants Jeffrey A. Myers and Andrew James

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 Word Perfect Version X3 in 14 point Times New Roman.
- 2. I further certify that this brief complies with the page or type-volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) 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 13,456 words; and

11 ...

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

12 | . . .

13 | . . .

14 ...

15 | . . .

16 ...

17 | . .

18 ...

- 1

19 ...

20 | . .

21 ...

22 | . . .

23 | . . .

24 ...

25 | . . .

26 ...

27

3. Finally, I hereby certify that I have read this Appellants' Opening 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 to the record to be supported by a referenced to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where the matter relied on is to be found. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that this accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

DATED this day of April, 2023.

CAP & KUDLER

By:

Donald C Kudler, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 005041
3202 W. Charleston, Blvd.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
Attorney for Appellants
Jeffrey A. Myers and
Andrew James

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

^	EEMITTEMIE OF SERVICE
2	I certify that on this day of April, 2023, I served a copy of the foregoing
3	document upon all counsel of record by electronic service by filing the foregoing
4	with the Clerk of Court using the E-Flex system, which will electronically mail the
5	filing to the following:
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Alexander F. Giovanniello, Esq. Christopher J. Giovanniello, Esq. Email: cjg@giolawgroup.com Email: service@giolawgroup.com Giovanniello Law Group 3753 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Ste. 200 Las Vegas, NV 89169 Tel No. (702) 784-7638 Attorney for Defendants THI of Nevada at Cheyenne, LLC; Healthcare Realty of Cheyenne, LLC; and Fundamental Administrative Services, LLC
15 16	DATED this 5 day of April, 2023.
17	Nach
18	Employee of CAP & KUDLER
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

26

27