

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SUSAN REEVES,
Appellant,
vs.
DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS; AND NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION,
Respondents.

No. 62468

FILED

OCT 17 2013

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY R. Malone
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER REGARDNG PRO BONO COUNSEL

This is a proper person appeal from a district court order dismissing a petition for judicial review in a workers' compensation matter. Having considered the record and the civil proper person appeal statement filed by appellant, this court has determined that the appointment of pro bono counsel to represent appellant would assist this court in reviewing this appeal. By this order, the court expresses no opinion as to the merits of this appeal.

Pro bono counsel is an attorney who provides legal services without charge for the benefit of the public good. The appointment of pro bono counsel provides attorneys with an opportunity to volunteer legal services in furtherance of their professional responsibility and, at the same time, allows financially eligible litigants access to quality legal representation without cost. Currently, the Appellate Litigation Section, Pro Bono Committee, State Bar of Nevada (Pro Bono Committee) is coordinating the selection of pro bono counsel for appeals identified by this court. Counsel will be appointed for purposes of this appeal only, and will participate in oral argument. Appellant may decline the appointment of

cc: Susan Reeves
Dept. of Business and Industry/Div. of Industrial
Relations/Henderson
Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Barbara E. Buckley,
Executive Director
Anne Traum, Coordinator, Appellate Litigation Section,
Pro Bono Committee, State Bar of Nevada

Docket No. 62468, Reeves v. Dep't of Indus. Relations

In this case, appellant requested the log of insurer-physician communications pursuant to NRS 616D.330, and appellant asserted that her workers' compensation benefits should not have been denied on the basis of these communications. The appeals officer dismissed the matter for lack of jurisdiction, finding that appellant had not requested a benefit penalty, *see* NRS 616D.140, NRS 616D.120, and the district court dismissed the petition for judicial review.