

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

2                                   \*\*\*\*\*

3   LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., A  
4   NEVADA CORPORATION, AND  
5   SANDS CHINA LTD., A CAYMAN  
6   ISLANDS CORPORATION

7                                   Petitioners,

8   v.

9   CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT  
10   COURT, THE HONORABLE  
11   ELIZABETH GONZALEZ,  
12   DISTRICT JUDGE, DEPT. 11,

13                                  Respondents,

14   and

15   STEVEN C. JACOBS,

16                                  Real Party in Interest.

Case No.: 67576 Electronically Filed  
Mar 30 2015 10:54 a.m.  
Tracie K. Lindeman  
Clerk of Supreme Court

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST  
STEVEN C. JACOBS' ERRATA TO  
CONSOLIDATED ANSWER TO  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS;  
AND OPPOSITION TO  
EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY**

17           Real Party in Interest Steven C. Jacobs hereby files this Errata to his  
18   Consolidated Answer to Petition for Writ of Prohibition or Mandamus and  
19   Opposition to Emergency Motion to Stay regarding the table of contents and  
20   certificate of service. Corrected copies of the table of contents and the certificate of  
21   service are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B.

22           DATED this 30<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015.

23                                  PISANELLI BICE PLLC

24           By:                   /s/ Todd L. Bice

25                                  James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027  
26                                  Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534  
27                                  Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695  
28                                  Jordan T. Smith, Esq., Bar No. 12097  
                                    400 South 7th Street, Suite 300  
                                    Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorneys for Real Party in Interest  
Steven C. Jacobs

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this 30<sup>th</sup> day of March 2015, I electronically filed and served a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST STEVEN C. JACOBS' ERRATA TO CONSOLIDATED ANSWER TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS; AND OPPOSITION TO EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY** properly addressed to the following:

J. Stephen Peek, Esq.  
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor  
Las Vegas, NV 89134

J. Randall Jones, Esq.  
Mark M. Jones, Esq.  
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

Steve Morris, Esq.  
Rosa Solis-Rainey, Esq.  
MORRIS LAW GROUP  
300 South Fourth Street, Suite 900  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

**SERVED VIA HAND-DELIERY ON 03/20/13**

The Honorable Elizabeth Gonzalez  
Eighth Judicial District court, Dept. XI  
Regional Justice Center  
200 Lewis Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

/s/ Cinda Towne  
An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

# EXHIBIT A

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|             |   |           |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| <b>I</b>    | <b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>II.</b>  | <b>FACTS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES PRESENTED BY THE PETITION</b> .....   | <b>3</b>  |
|             | <b>A.</b> <b>The Jurisdictional Dispute Is Not As SCL Pretends.</b> .....   | <b>3</b>  |
|             | <b>B.</b> <b>Petitioners Deceive The District Court As To The Location And Their Access To Jurisdictional Evidence.</b> ..... | <b>5</b>  |
|             | <b>C.</b> <b>The District Court's First Sanctions Order.</b> .....  | <b>9</b>  |
|             | <b>D.</b> <b>SCL Continues To Violate the District Court's Discovery and Sanctions Orders.</b> .....                          | <b>9</b>  |
|             | <b>E.</b> <b>The Recent Evidentiary Hearing and the District Court's Extensive Findings Again Expose SCL.</b> .....           | <b>11</b> |
|             | <b>F.</b> <b>The Prejudice To Jacobs Is Unmistakable.</b> .....   | <b>15</b> |
| <b>III.</b> | <b>REASONS WHY THE WRIT SHOULD NOT ISSUE AND THE STAY LIFTED</b> .....  | <b>18</b> |
|             | <b>A.</b> <b>Writ Relief Is Not Available To Review Interlocutory Sanctions Orders.</b> .....                                 | <b>18</b> |
|             | <b>B.</b> <b>The District Court Did Not Manifestly Abuse Its Discretion or Act Arbitrarily and Capriciously.</b> .....        | <b>22</b> |
|             | <b>1.</b> <b>The redactions are relevant and important to jurisdictional discovery.</b> .....                                 | <b>24</b> |
|             | <b>2.</b> <b>Jacobs' discovery requests were specific.</b> .....  | <b>30</b> |
|             | <b>3.</b> <b>The redacted documents remain in Macau and there are no substitutes.</b> .....                                   | <b>30</b> |
|             | <b>4.</b> <b>Jacobs does not have substantially equivalent means to obtain the redacted Information.</b> .....                | <b>31</b> |
|             | <b>5.</b> <b>The United States' interest outweighs Macau's supposed interests.</b> .....                                      | <b>33</b> |
|             | <b>D.</b> <b>The Sanctions are Justified By NRCP 37.</b> .....  | <b>36</b> |
|             | <b>1.</b> <b>Sands China's violation of the District Court's Order is Willful.</b> .....                                      | <b>37</b> |
|             | <b>2.</b> <b>Jacobs has been severely prejudiced.</b> .....   | <b>38</b> |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| 3.  | The District Court imposed lesser sanctions than warranted by Sands China's Conduct..... | 38 |
| 4.  | The remaining <i>Young</i> factors justify the Sanctions. ....                           | 41 |
| E.  | The District Court's Sanctions Easily Comport With Due Process. ....                     | 41 |
| F.  | Sands China's Request for Reassignment Must be Denied. ....                              | 43 |
| 1.  | SCL's request is procedurally improper.....  | 44 |
| 2.  | Sands China Cannot Meet the Standard for Disqualification. ....                          | 45 |
| IV. | CONCLUSION.....  | 47 |
|     | CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....   | 48 |
|     | CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....  | 49 |

# EXHIBIT B

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of Pisanelli Bice, and that on this 27<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015, I electronically filed and served a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing **CONSOLIDATED ANSWER TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR MANDAMUS; AND OPPOSITION TO EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY** properly addressed to the following:

J. Stephen Peek, Esq.  
Robert J. Cassity, Esq.  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor  
Las Vegas, NV 89134

J. Randall Jones, Esq.  
Mark M. Jones, Esq.  
KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

Steve Morris, Esq.  
Rosa Solis-Rainey, Esq.  
MORRIS LAW GROUP  
300 South Fourth Street, Suite 900  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

**SERVED VIA HAND-DELIERY ON 03/20/13**  
The Honorable Elizabeth Gonzalez  
Eighth Judicial District court, Dept. XI  
Regional Justice Center  
200 Lewis Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

/s/ Cinda Towne  
An employee of Pisanelli Bice, PLLC