

MELVIN R. GRIMES, ESQ.
State Bar of Nevada No. 12972
ROBERTS STOFFEL FAMILY LAW GROUP
4411 S. Pecos Road
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121
PH: (702) 474-7007
FAX: (702) 474-7477
EMAIL: efile@lvfamilylaw.com
Attorneys for Appellant

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

MAGGIE ROE, N/K/A MAGGIE
COX,

Appellant,

v.

JASON ROE,

Respondent.

Supreme Court No.: 84893

CHILD CUSTODY FAST TRACK STATEMENT

1. Name of Party filing this fast statement:

Maggie Cox

**2. Name, law firm, address, and telephone number of attorney submitting
this fast track statement:**

Melvin R. Grimes, Esq.
Nevada Bar Number 12972
ROBERTS STOFFEL FAMILY LAW GROUP
4411 S. Pecos Road
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121
702-474-7007

3. Judicial district, county, and district court docket number of lower court proceedings:

Eighth Judicial District Court
In and for the County of Clark
District Court No.: D-11-450074-D

4. Name of judge issuing judgment or order appealed from:

Honorable Dawn Throne

5. Length of trial or evidentiary hearing.

3 days

6. Written order or judgment appealed from:

Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order filed May 18, 2022

7. Date that written notice of the appealed written judgment or order's entry was served:

May 18, 2022

8. If the time for filing the notice of appeal was tolled by the timely filing of a motion listed in NRAP 4(a)(4),

(a) specify the type of motion, and the date and method of service of the motion, and date of filing:

N/A

(b) date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion:

N/A

9. Date notice of appeal was filed:

June 9, 2022

10. Specify statute or rule governing the time limit for filing the notice of appeal, e.g., NRAP 4(a), NRS 155.190, or other:

NRAP 4(a)

11. Specify the statute, rule or other authority which grants this court jurisdiction to review the judgment or order appealed from:

NRAP 3A(b)(1)

12. Pending and prior proceedings in this court. List the case name and docket number of all appeals or original proceedings presently or previously pending before this court which involve the same or some of the same parties to this appeal:

N/A

13. Proceedings raising same issues. If you are aware of any other appeal or original proceeding presently pending before this court, which raise the same legal issue(s) you intend to raise in this appeal, list the case name(s) and docket number(s) of those proceedings:

N/A

14. Procedural history. Briefly describe the procedural history of the case:

This appeal is brought due to post-Divorce litigation. The Appellant filed for a Divorce on July 28, 2011. Respondent filed his Answer and Counterclaim August 8, 2011. The Parties were Divorced after a three (3) day evidentiary hearing, with Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Decree of Divorce filed February 6, 2013. The Parties were Ordered to Share Joint Legal and Joint Physical custody of their one minor child.

Respondent filed his Countermotion seeking to change custody September 9, 2013. Respondent's next motion to modify custody was filed October 20, 2015. Defendant next sought to change custody November 1, 2016.

Appellant has been forced to file Motions for Orders to Show Cause throughout the years of litigation. Appellant filed a Motion August 12, 2013, another June 6, 2014, another November 2, 2015, and another October 10, 2016. Each of these Motions were asking for Defendant to comply with earlier orders.

Appellant filed a Motion to Modify Custody, a brief focused assessment, and permit counseling July 27, 2020. (ROA000001-000035). The allegations of the Motion are primarily an increase in angry and compulsive behavior by the minor child. (ROA000007- 000010). Respondent filed his opposition and countermotion seeking a change of custody with him being awarded Primary Physical Custody. (ROA000070- 000104). The Motion, Opposition, and Countermotion were heard August 27, 2020. The court granted the Appellant's request for a brief focused

assessment and granted appellant's request the child attend counseling. (ROA000135-000142). The matter was set for a return hearing January 7, 2021.

The matter was reassigned from the Honorable Bill Henderson to the Honorable Dawn Throne January 4, 2021. The hearing date was changed to February 25, 2021. The court heard argument from counsel and reviewed the brief focused assessment. Respondent filed his emergency motion for sole custody a mere twenty (20) days later. (ROA000154-000164). Respondent asserted that Appellant had the child arrested. (ROA000156). This matter was heard March 22, 2021, on an Order Shortening Time. The court awarded Respondent sole physical custody and limited Appellant's contact to therapeutic contact only. (ROA000292-000301). The Court also appointed a Guardian ad Litem with the costs to be borne equally. *Id.* The court then ordered the appointment of a Parenting Coordinator June 3, 2021, with the costs to be borne equally. *Id.* The court issued its next order July 30, 2021, where it modified child support. Appellant was faced with a retroactive order that she owed child support rather than receiving child support. Further, the court then imposed child support based on the sole physical custody order of \$700.00 per month to Respondent. (ROA000374-000377).

The Parties were next before the court September 27, 2021, on Defendant's Objections. (ROA000392-000401). The court discharged the Guardian Ad Litem and continued the Parenting Coordinator, now shifting all of the costs to the

Appellant. The matter was set for an Evidentiary Hearing March 10 and March 11, 2022. (ROA000485-000494). The court then made comments recommending settlement as the outcome was a forgone conclusion. Appellant objected and immediately filed a Motion to Recuse Judge Throne. (ROA000517-000538). The Motion was reviewed by the Honorable Judge Marie Bell and a Decision and Order denying the recusal was entered January 20, 2022. (ROA000582-000588).

The Parties were next before the district court February 22, 2022, for a calendar call. The Parties declared ready for trial. The matter came before the court on a non-jury evidentiary hearing March 10, March 11.

15. Statement of facts. Briefly set forth the facts material to the issues on appeal:

Appellant filed a Motion for an Order to Permit Counseling when the Respondent refused to permit counseling. (ROA000001). Respondent filed a countermotion to modify custody asserting mental defect of the Appellant. (ROA000122) The matter came before the Honorable Bill Henderson August 27, 2020. The court made specific orders regarding conduct, permitted counseling, orders brief focused assessments. (ROA000258).

The Parties appeared before the court for a Pre-Trial Conference February 22, 2022. (ROA 000640). The court revealed a updated report from Dr. Collins dated

January 17, 2022. (ROA000641). The court indicated it had read the report, considered the report, and stated,

I'm sure Mr. Grimes understands that his client put him in a bad position and not moving forward in a diligent matter with the reunification therapy period I can't imagine he doesn't see that. So, I mean, is it going forward there? I mean she hasn't had much contact because of her own behavior. (ROA000647).

The court continued by stating,

I get what you're saying... but (pause), they're entitled to a trial before I make a permanent order, both of you want a permanent order. (ROA000648).

The Court is aware that the *Romano v. Romano* decision was issued during the proceedings of this case. 138 Nev. Adv. Op. 1 (Nev. 2022). Based on the holding and the need for a substantial change in circumstances affecting the welfare of the children to modify the custody arrangement, Appellant withdrew her request for a change of custody to Primary Physical Custody and sought the court maintain the present Order. (ROA000662).

The Court will note the Respondent's Moving Papers never assert a change in circumstances affecting the well-being of the child. (ROA 000070-000102. Respondent's Pre-Trial Memorandum attempts to cure this deficiency. (ROA 000599-000600). The court will note Respondent asserts Appellant's behavior and the impact of her behavior and the change in circumstance. (*Id.*)

Respondent called the Guardian Ad Litem as a witness. (ROA000664). Respondent asked the witness to relay to the court the minor child's thoughts and ideas regarding custody. (ROA000666). Appellant Objected as hearsay and the court overruled the objection. The witness was permitted to relay multiple conversations and requests by the minor child. (ROA000666 - 000671).

Appellant offered to waive scope of questioning regarding the Parties to permit the Parties to only testify once. (ROA000691). Respondent declined the offer requesting that questions maintain scope. *Id.*

Respondent next took the stand as a witness. (RAO000692). Respondent was asked about the opinion of the minor child as to where he should live. (ROA000705). Respondent answered the child would want to live with him. *Id.* Appellant objected to hearsay. *Id.* The court overruled and again permitted child hearsay into the proceedings. *Id.* Respondent is next asked about communications with Respondent by the minor child and what the child has told the Respondent. (ROA000726). Appellant again Objected as to hearsay; oce again the court permitted the child hearsay. *Id.*

Respondent provided testimony regarding a dog attack on the minor child during his custodial time. (ROA000733-000742). Respondent testified that he notified the Appellant of the attack and the Emergency Room visit during the night or very early in the morning. (ROA000739). Respondent was shown to have

committed perjury and that he did not notify the Appellant of the attack, emergency treatment, multiple sutures and admission to the hospital until after discharge from the hospital and after several more hours had passed. (ROA000740).

Respondent on cross examination is asked about the reasons he believes the Appellant has developed mental health issues. (ROA000776-000777). Respondent asserts two events which predated the controlling order as evidence of the deterioration of Appellant's mental health. (ROA000777). Respondent continues testifying that in the same situation of March 16, 2021 he would have reacted the same manner as the Appellant responded. (ROA000778-000781).

Respondent also called the court appointed reunification therapist, Dr. Collins, to testify. (ROA001007-001065). The Respondent authenticated and moved for admission two (2) reports generated by Dr. Collins. (ROA001016 and ROA001028-001029). Dr. Collins also testified on cross-examination about a resist-refuse-dynamic. (ROA 001031-001040). On examination by the court Dr. Collins testified, "I don't have concern that she's going to attempt to, you know, physically harm him or even that she wants to harm him in any way." (ROA001053).

Respondent next called the Appellant as a witness. (ROA001066-001322). Appellant was subjected to extensive and hostile examination by the Respondent. Followed by examination by her counsel. The Appellant remained focused and answered the questions of everyone. The court then undertook its own examination

of the Appellant which lasted 1 hour and 14 minutes. After extensive examination where the court goes far beyond the scope of either examination the court makes the following comments:

I want you to do that in a manner that's safe and healthy for both of you, but you're not at that point with Hunter. (ROA001278).

I didn't want to be here yesterday. I don't want to do this trial. But Mr. Roe is entitled to have an end to the litigation, so I had to give him a trial. (ROA001294).

Following the final comment Appellant's counsel had to respectfully request that the questioning stop as the court had so traumatized the Appellant as to make her break down in tears. The court's comments throughout this questioning and especially the final comments made it clear that the court had predetermined the outcome of this case. This matter was set for another day two weeks later for the end of presentations and closing arguments.

The Appellant was recalled on March 31, 2022. Following further direct and cross examination the Respondent rested their case. Appellant moved the court for a directed verdict pursuant to NRCP 52. Appellant specifically asserted that the Respondent had failed to show a Substantial Change in Circumstances. (ROA001635). The court denied the motion. *Id.* The court was asked to place on the record the change in circumstance and the court asserted "the deterioration in Plaintiff's relationship with Hunter." (ROA001636). The court's holding was not one

of the changes in circumstances asserted by the Respondent in his moving papers and further illustrates the court's predetermined outcome. (ROA000073-000075).

Appellant called the court appointed therapist assigned to complete a brief focused assessment of the Parties, Maureen Zelenski. (ROA001668-001707). A scholarly article on resist refuse dynamic was admitted (ROA001672). Ms. Zelenski testified she believed there was Parental Alienation taking place by the Respondent. (ROA001677-001678). Ms. Zelenski testified she believed there was Pathogenic Parenting taking place by the Respondent. (ROA001678). Ms. Zelenski also testified that Parental Alienation and Pathogenic Parenting constitute child abuse. *Id.*

The court then accepted testimony regarding the cost of presenting a court appointed evaluation. (ROA001679). This is important because the court later states, "[t]hat is money that could have been used for reunification counseling. (ROA001761).

The court then heard closing argument by both counsel. (ROA001766-001791). The court then reaching into a file folder and read into the record a prepared findings of fact and conclusions of law. (ROA001791-001810).

16. Issues on appeal. State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal:

- A. Whether a court can admit child testimony through a Guardian Ad Litem over the objection of a Party.

- B. Whether the court abused its discretion in finding a change in circumstances since the last custodial order.
- C. Whether the court demonstrated actual bias toward the Appellant and failed to recuse herself.
- D. Whether the court abused its discretion in issuing biased and prejudicial interlocutory orders.
- E. Whether the court's Order after hearing is an abuse of discretion and violates the Appellant's Constitutional Rights.
- F. Whether the court's award of Attorney's Fees was an abuse of discretion.

17. Legal argument, including authorities:

- A. The Court cannot consider child testimony not subject to cross examination.**

[D]ue process of law [is] guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 8(5)... of the Nevada Constitution." *Rico v. Rodriguez*, 121 Nev. 695, 702–03, 120 P.3d 812, 817 (2005). Due process protects certain substantial and fundamental rights, including the interest parents have in the custody of their children. *Id.* at 704, 120 P.3d at 818. Further, due process demands notice before such a right is affected. *Wiese v. Granata*, 110 Nev. 1410, 1412, 887 P.2d 744, 745 (1994). Accordingly, a "party

threatened with loss of parental rights must be given opportunity to disprove evidence presented." *Wallace v. Wallace*, 112 Nev. 1015, 1020, 922 P.2d 541, 544 (1996) (citing *Wiese*, 110 Nev. at 1413, 887 P.2d at 746).

Nevada adopted the Uniform Child Witness Testimony by Alternative Means Act. *Gordon v. Geiger*, 402 P.3d 671, 675 (Nev. 2017). Child interviews must be recorded and must abide by the Act." *Id.*

The Act also sets forth constitutional safeguards. In conducting the alternative method of obtaining child witness testimony, the district court must afford each party with a full and fair opportunity to examine or cross-examine the child witness. *Gordon* at 676 citing NRS 50.610.

Here the court permitted the Guardian ad Litem (GAL) to interview the child. The court did not mandate the interviews to be recorded. The court further permitted the GAL to testify to the child's wishes and comments without the opportunity to cross-examine or further demonstrate that outside forces influenced the child as to his wishes.

This Court must find that the court abused its discretion in permitting hearsay testimony of the child without compliance with the Act. The Court must there direct the court below to ignore the comments from the GAL and all other sources about the relationship of the child and Appellant and remand this matter back for a new hearing.

B. The District Court Abused its Discretion in Finding a Change of Circumstance that was never pled, but was asserted by the district court.

While review for abuse of discretion is ordinarily deferential, deference is not owed to legal error. *AA Primo Builders, LLC v. Washington*, 245 P.3d 1190, 16 (Nev. 2010).

The Court has held that a court may modify a joint or primary physical custody arrangement only when "(1) there has been a substantial change in circumstances affecting the welfare of the child, and (2) the child's best interest is served by the modification. *Romano v. Romano*, 138 Nev. Adv. Op. 1, 6 (Nev. 2022). The moving party in a custody proceeding must show that circumstances . . . have substantially changed since the most recent custodial order . . . [e]vents that took place before that proceeding [are] inadmissible to establish a change of circumstances. *McMonigle v. McMonigle*, 110 Nev. 1407, 1408 (Nev. 1995).

Respondent's pleadings asserted strange behavior and mental health issues, including an outburst at Green Valley Christian School. (ROA000074-000075 and ROA001791). Respondent's Pre-trial Memorandum also asserts the same conduct and concerns for the basis of a change of custody. (ROA000591-000592). The testimony, as outlined above, asserted Appellants mental health and strange outbursts. Further the testimony regarding specific events all related to events prior

to 2017 or events which occurred after the Countermotion to Modify was filed. (ROA000698-000704).

The change in behavior of the minor child was shown through reports and testimony to be likely due pathogenic parenting undertaken by the Respondent. (ROA001670-001671). Ms. Zelenski testified that parental alienation exists in this case. (ROA001673 and ROA001677-001678). Further, Ms. Zelenski testified that this conduct constituted abuse. *Id.* The district court created its own change in circumstances by deciding the “deteriorating relationship” was a changed circumstance. (ROA001636). This was never pled by the Respondent and only argued after the district court handed that finding from the bench.

The court blamed Appellant for the child being arrested and charged and ultimately convicted of domestic battery. The court blamed Appellant for the second arrest despite the Respondent being the person that called the police. The court blamed the Appellant for the child running away from mom, despite testimony the child was in the bathroom, on the phone with Respondent.

The Respondent was shown by substantial evidence to have lied to the court. Respondent asserted he was swarmed by police, video showed this to be untrue. Respondent testified that Appellant became extremely loud and emotional at the Juvenile Justice Center, the video showed this to be false. The video actually showed the person acting improperly was Respondent.

This Court should be further concerned that the district court held against Appellant the fact she paid for an attorney and had her mother provide money to present a court appointed expert.

The Court, in reviewing the pleadings and the testimony can see, Respondent failed to present substantial evidence of a change in circumstances since the last custodial order.

C. The court was so demonstratively biased, the court should have recused herself.

A motion to disqualify may be brought under *NRS* § 1.235 based on *NRS* § 1.230 and/or pursuant to the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct. *See Towbin Dodge, LLC v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, 121 Nev. 251, 257, 112 P.3d 1063, 1067 (2005) (citing *PETA v. Bobby Berosini, Ltd.*, 111 Nev. 431, 435, 894 P.2d 337, 340 (1995)).

NRS § 1.230(1) provides that “[a] judge shall not act as such in an action or proceeding when the judge entertains actual bias or prejudice for or against one of the parties to the action” and *NRS* § 1.230(3) states, “[a] judge, upon the judge’s own motion, may disqualify himself or herself from acting in any matter upon the ground of actual or implied bias.”

Here, the district court failed to act in an impartial manner, has shown bias, and has failed to avoid impropriety and/or the appearance of impropriety. The

district court's comments and Orders have shown that she blames Appellant for the Minor Child's violent behavior and for the rift between mother and child. The district court has ignored police reports stating that the minor child was the primary aggressor in the altercations that occurred at Appellant's house and despite the child's therapist, MILLER, stating that the child would benefit from a joint physical custody arrangement and despite ZELENSKY's report stating that Respondent has actively engaged in parental alienation, the district court consistently ruled against Appellant in ways that limit Appellant's time with and access to the minor child. Further, the district court's rulings frequently go against the advise of mental health professionals regarding the best interests of the minor child.

The district court, through her comments and Orders, demonstrated actual bias against Appellant and has showed that she was not capable of being impartial in this matter. This is reinforced by the court's ignoring reports of parental alienation, coaching, and the demonstrated lack of candor by Respondent.

The court's actions of interrogation of the Appellant far beyond court's voir dire but extending to a seventy four minute interrogation and rebuke. (ROA001231-001304). The court's comments that made it clear the outcome was a foregone conclusion. (ROA1306). The court's ability to listen to three days of testimony and immediately reach into a folder and read her decision into the record

illustrate the court had predetermined the outcome of this case. (ROA001791-001816).

The Appellant did not receive an unbiased and fair trial. The court determined the outcome before the calendar call and her comments, as outlined above, make that clear.

The court has a duty to hear all of the evidence and render a decision only on the evidence admitted and testimony heard at the time of trial. Here, the court consider extraneous knowledge not admitted and even spoke to this information during the trail.

This court must find that Appellant did not receive a fair and unbiased trial. The matter should be reversed and remanded for a new evidentiary hearing before a different Judge randomly assigned.

D. The court's Interlocutory Orders were improper and created most of the issues creating the trial

Interlocutory appeals are generally disfavored. *Yonker Constr. v. Hulme*, 126 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 54, 55406 (2010), 248 P.3d 313, 3 (Nev. 2010). This Court is aware that Writs regarding interlocutory orders are generally denied pending an evidentiary hearing. See NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330; *D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 123 Nev. 468, 474-75, 168 P.3d 731, 736-37 (2007).

Nev. Rev. Stat. § 125C.0025(2) provides, “For assistance in determining whether an award of joint physical custody is appropriate, the court may direct that an investigation be conducted.”

This Court reviews child custody decision for an abuse of discretion, but "the district court must have reached its conclusions for the appropriate reasons." *Ellis v. Carucci*, 123 Nev. 145, 149, 161 P.3d 239, 241-42 (2007).

Here the court temporarily modified custody based on the arrest of the child and the assertion by the Respondent regarding misconduct. The court ordered reunification therapy which goes beyond the court’s authority. The court is limited by the statute, which permits an investigation completed to “assist” in determining the appropriate custody arrangement. The court ignored the brief focused assessment and ordered therapy which goes beyond the statutory authority of the court.

This Court has previously asserted that mental health assessment being ordered pursuant to EDCR 5.305 is appropriate. *Wagner v. Marino*, No. 73611, at *5 (Nev. App. June 28, 2018). However, that is not what was ordered here.

The district court changed custody, which rewarded the parental alienation that was found. This order also entrenched a child dealing with RRD. Further, the Order created greater distance between the child and parent. This order was done

without an evidentiary hearing and in polar contrast the findings of the prior court over an eight year period.

This court must also address that these Orders happen daily in family court. Here, Appellant suddenly lost her child, was ordered to pay for counseling, was ordered to pay child support, was ordered to pay for reunification and was required to pay for an evidentiary hearing. These types of interlocutory orders have financial impact on Parties far beyond this case. These Orders bankrupt parties and place them in a position where they cannot afford to fight for their children or their rights.

Here, the district court made repeated comments throughout the proceedings that indicated she should have not paid for her attorney, she should not have paid a witness, she should not have maintained her employment.

There is no statutory authority for the court to order the reunification therapy in this case. The parties shared joint physical custody until the court cut off all communication, creating the need for reunification. This Court must stop this conduct of the district courts and direct that interlocutory orders remain within the confines of the statutory language.

E. The Court's Order so Limits contact between Parent and Child it Violates the Appellant's Constitutional Rights.

The US Supreme Court held in *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390, 399, 401 (1923), that the "liberty" protected by the Due Process Clause includes the right of parents to "establish a home and bring up children" and "to control the education of their own." Two years later, in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510, 534-535 (1925), The US Supreme Court held that the "liberty of parents and guardians" includes the right "to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control." The US Supreme Court explained in *Pierce* that "[t]he child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations." *Id.*, at 535. The US Supreme Court returned to the subject in *Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158 (1944), and again confirmed that there is a constitutional dimension to the right of parents to direct the upbringing of their children. "It is cardinal with us that the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first in the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the state can neither supply nor hinder." *Id.*, at 166.

Here, there is not a single substantiated abuse and neglect claim reported to CPS. The district court made no findings of abuse or neglect. The court merely found that the relationship had deteriorated.

The court's order has removed all parental contact between parent and child. Appellant has no ability to interact with the child.

Meanwhile, the parent who is committing Abuse is permitted unlimited access and to continue to impede and undermine the parent child relationship.

The court's order violates the Constitutional Rights of the parent. This Court must intervene and stop this conduct by district courts. When courts are going to interfere with the parent child relationship and restrict in the manner describe here, there should be a referral to Abuse and Neglect pursuant to NRS 432B. The parents are then protected by due process and still have the ability to maintain a relationship and contact with the child.

F. The court's Order for Attorney's fees was an abuse of discretion.

The district court's decision to award attorney fees is within its discretion and "will not be disturbed on appeal absent a manifest abuse of discretion." *Bobby Berosini, Ltd. v. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals*, 114 Nev. 1348, 1353-54, 971 P.2d 383, 386 (1998).

Here the court was so manifestly biased against the Appellant that the outcome was predetermined. The Appellant brought her claims and defenses in good faith and in an attempt to protect the child. The court should not have awarded fees to Respondent.

18. Issues of first impression or of public interest. Does this appeal present a substantial legal issue of first impression in this jurisdiction or one affecting an important public interest: Yes No . If so, explain:

The Issue of interlocutory Orders and their impact coupled with the issue of Constitutional infringement mandate this matter remain with the Nevada Supreme Court.

19. Routing Statement:

This appeal is presumptively assigned to the Court of Appeals per NRAP 17(b)(5), because it involves an issue of family law. Appellant respectfully submits, however, that the Supreme Court retain this case pursuant to NRAP 17(a)(14), because the issue of interlocutory orders and the impact of temporary custody orders on the posture of the case is of statewide importance.

DATED this 11th day of November 2022.

ROBERTS STOFFEL FAMILY LAW GROUP



Melyin R. Grimes, Esq.
State of Nevada Bar No. 12972
4411 South Pecos Road
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121
PH: (702) 474-7007
FAX: (702) 474-7477
EMAIL: efile@lvfamilylaw.com

VERIFICATION

1. I hereby certify that this fast track statement 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 fast track statement has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word–Office 365 Business in font type Times New Roman size 14.

2. I further certify that this fast track statement 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 either:

Proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more and contains

5031 words; or

Monospaced, has 10.5 or fewer characters per inch, and contains ___ words

or ___ lines of text; or

Does not exceed ___ pages.

3. Finally, I recognize that under NRAP 3E I am responsible for timely filing a fast track statement and that the Supreme Court of Nevada may impose sanctions for failing to timely file a fast track statement, or failing to raise material issues or arguments in the fast track statement. I therefore certify that the information provided in this fast track statement is true and complete to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

DATED this 15th day of November 2022.

ROBERTS STOFFEL FAMILY LAW GROUP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Grimes', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is enclosed within a large, hand-drawn oval.

Melvin R. Grimes, Esq.
State of Nevada Bar No. 12972
4411 South Pecos Road
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121
PH: (702) 474-7007
FAX: (702) 474-7477
EMAIL: efile@lvfamilylaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, an employee of The Grimes Law Office, hereby certify that on the 15th day of November, 2020, I served a true and correct copy of this Child Custody Fast Track Statement as follows:

by United States mail in Las Vegas, Nevada, with First-Class postage prepaid and addressed as follows:

[Name]
[Address]
[Address]

via the Supreme Court's electronic filing and service system (eFlex):

Fred Page, Esq.
Page Law Firm
6930 South Cimarron Rd. Ste. 140
Las Vegas, NV 89113
fpage@pagelawoffice.com



Employee of Roberts Stoffel Family Law
Group