IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

AARON MORGAN, INDIVIDUALLY,

Appellant,

VS.

No. 77753

Electronically Filed Jan 31 2019 09:12 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

DAVID E. LUJAN, INDIVIDUALLY; AND HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC, A FOREIGN LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY,

Respondents.

DOCKETING STATEMENT CIVIL APPEALS

GENERAL INFORMATION

All appellants not in proper person must complete this docketing statement. NRAP 14(a). The purpose of the docketing statement is to assist the Court in screening jurisdiction, classifying cases for en banc, panel, or expedited treatment, compiling statistical information and identifying parties and their counsel.

WARNING

This statement must be completed fully, accurately and on time. NRAP 14(c). The Court may impose sanctions on counsel or appellant if it appears that the information provided is incomplete or inaccurate. *Id.* Failure to fill out the statement completely or to file it in a timely manner constitutes grounds for the imposition of sanctions, including a fine and/or dismissal of the appeal.

A complete list of the documents that must be attached appears as Question 26 on this docketing statement. Failure to attach all required documents will result in the delay of your appeal and may result in the imposition of sanctions.

This court has noted that when attorneys do not take seriously their obligations under NRAP 14 to complete the docketing statement properly and conscientiously, they waste the valuable judicial resources of this court, making the imposition of sanctions appropriate. *See* <u>KDI Sylvan Pools v. Workman</u>, 107 Nev. 340, 344, 810 P.2d 1217, 1220 (1991). Please use tab dividers to separate any attached documents.

1. Judicial District <u>Eighth</u> Department <u>XI</u> County <u>Clark</u> Judge <u>Honorable Elizabeth Gonzalez</u> District Ct. Case No. A-15-718679-C

2. Attorney filing this docketing statement:

Attorney Micah S. Echols, Esq. and Thomas W. Stewart, Esq. Telephone 702-382-0711
Firm Marquis Aurbach Coffing
Address 10001 Park Run Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89145

Attorney <u>Benjamin P. Cloward, Esq. and Bryan A. Boyack, Esq.</u> Telephone <u>702-444-4444</u> Firm <u>Richard Harris Law Firm</u> Address <u>801 South Fourth Street, Las Vegas, NV 89101</u>

Client Aaron M. Morgan

3. Attorney(s) representing respondent(s):

Client Harvest Management Sub LLC

Attorney <u>Douglas J. Gardner, Esq.</u>
Telephone <u>702-940-2222</u>
Firm <u>Rands, South & Gardner</u>
Address <u>1055 Whitney Ranch Drive, Suite 220, Henderson, NV 89014</u>
Client <u>David E. Lujan</u>

Attorney Dennis L. Kennedy, Esq.; Sarah E. Harmon, Esq.; Joshua P. Gilmore, Esq.; and Andrea M. Champion, Esq.
Telephone 702-562-8820
Firm Bailey Kennedy
Address 8984 Spanish Ridge Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89148

4.	Nature of disposition below (check all that apply):
	 Judgment after bench trial ✓ Judgment after jury verdict ✓ Summary judgment ✓ Default judgment ✓ Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief ✓ Grant/Denial of injunction ✓ Grant/Denial of declaratory relief ✓ Review of agency determination ✓ Other (specify) ✓ Divorce decree: ✓ Original ✓ Other disposition (specify) November 28, 2018 Order on Plaintiffs' Motion for Entry of Judgment (Exhibit 3). ✓ December 17, 2018 Judgment Upon the Jury Verdict (Exhibit 4).
5.	Does this appeal raise issues concerning any of the following: N/A. Child Custody Venue Termination of parental rights
6.	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 are related to this appeal:
	This case has not been the subject of a prior appeal or writ proceeding before this Court.
7.	Pending and prior proceedings in other courts. List the case name, number and court of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts which are related to this appeal (<i>e.g.</i> , bankruptcy, consolidated or bifurcated proceedings) and their dates of disposition:
	Morgan v. Lujan and Harvest Management Sub LLC (Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A-15-718679-C)—the judgment upon the jury verdict was filed on December 17, 2018. This is the underlying case leading to this appeal.
8.	Nature of the action. Briefly describe the nature of the action and the result below:
	This case arises from an April 1, 2014 motor vehicle crash and the injuries sustained by Plaintiff, Aaron Morgan ("Morgan") in that crash. In his complaint, Morgan alleged three causes of action: (1) negligence against

Defendant, David E. Lujan ("Lujan"); (2) negligence per se against Lujan; and (3) vicarious liability/respondeat superior against Defendant, Harvest Management Sub LLC ("Harvest Management"). (**Exhibit 1**). The Defendants jointly answered the complaint and were jointly represented by the same counsel through both trials.

The case initially proceeded to trial in November, 2017. However, on the third day of the initial trial, the District Court declared a mistrial based on Defendants' counsel's misconduct. Following the mistrial, the case proceeded to a second trial in April, 2018. Throughout the litigation, all parties were aware that claims for damages were being pursued against both Defendants. Morgan's claim for vicarious liability was not contested during trial. Harvest Management's NRCP 30(b)(6) witness contested primary liability, but never contested Harvest Management's vicarious liability.

On the final day of trial, the District Court (Judge Linda Bell) sua sponte created a special verdict form that inadvertently included Lujan as the only Defendant in the caption. The District Court informed the parties of this omission, and the Defendants agreed they had no objection. Jury instructions were provided to the jury with the proper caption. The jury used those instructions to fill out the improperly-captioned special verdict form and render judgment in favor of Plaintiff—the jury found Defendants to be negligent and 100% at fault for the accident. As a result, the jury awarded Plaintiff \$2,980,000.

Following trial, Morgan moved the District Court (Judge Elizabeth Gonzalez) to enter its proposed judgment against both Defendants or to make an explicit finding that the omission of Harvest Management from the special verdict was inadvertent and to render judgment in favor of Morgan against both Defendants, jointly and severally. (**Exhibit 2**). The District Court denied Morgan's motion, leaving the judgment only as to Lujan due to the improperly-captioned special verdict form. The order denying Morgan's motion was filed on November 28, 2018, and the judgment upon jury verdict was filed on December 17, 2018. (**Exhibits 3** and **4**).

Due to the District Court's interlocutory order on his motion for entry of judgment, Morgan has appealed from the judgment on jury verdict, but seeks review of the interlocutory order denying his motion for entry of judgment.

- 9. **Issues on appeal.** State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal (attach separate sheets as necessary):
 - (1) Whether Judge Elizabeth Gonzalez should have transferred the case back to Judge Linda Bell for purposes of determining what happened at trial.
 - (2) Whether the evidence presented at trial demonstrates that the jury's verdict is against both Lujan and Harvest Management.
 - (3) Whether the District Court should have, alternatively, made a finding that the jury's verdict is against both Lujan and Harvest Management.
- 10. **Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues.** If you are aware of any proceeding presently pending before this court which raises the same or similar issues raised in this appeal, list the case name and docket numbers and identify the same or similar issue raised:

Morgan is not aware of any pending case raising the same or similar issues.

11. Constitutional issues. If this appeal challenges the constitutionality of a statute, and the state, any state agency, or any officer or employee thereof is not a party to this appeal, have you notified the clerk of this court and the attorney general in accordance with NRAP 44 and NRS 30.130?	,
⊠ N/A	
Yes	
□No	
If not, explain:	
12. Other issues. Does this appeal involve any of the following issues?	
 □ Reversal of well-settled Nevada precedent (identify the case(s)) □ An issue arising under the United States and/or Nevada Constitutions □ A substantial issue of first impression □ An issue of public policy ☑ An issue where en banc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of court's decisions □ A ballot question 	this
If so, explain: This case asks the Court to enforce the plain language of NRCP 49(a):	•

The court shall give to the jury such explanation and instruction concerning the matter thus submitted as may be necessary to enable the jury to make its findings upon each issue. If in so doing the court omits any issue of fact raised by the pleadings or by the evidence, each party waives the right to a trial by jury of the issue so omitted unless before the jury retires the party demands its submission to the jury. As to an issue omitted without such demand the court may make a finding; or, if it fails to do so, it shall be deemed to have made a finding in accord with the judgment on the special verdict.

Morgan is not aware of any Nevada case law construing these provisions.

13. Assignment to the Supreme Court of Appeals or retention in the Supreme Court. Briefly set forth whether the matter is presumptively retained by the Supreme Court or assigned to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, and cite the subparagraph(s) of the Rule under which the matter falls. If appellant believes that the Supreme Court should retain the case despite its presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals, identify the specific issue(s) or circumstance(s) that warrant retaining the case, and include an explanation of their importance or significance:

This case should be retained by the Supreme Court. The jury's verdict exceeds the \$250,000 threshold in a tort case, as outlined by NRAP 17(b)(5). As outlined in response to Question 12, this case also presents at least one issue of first impression, which is also of statewide importance. Thus, NRAP 17(a)(10) and (11) also support the Supreme Court retaining this appeal.

14. **Trial.** If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last?

The initial trial in November 2017 lasted 3 days before being declared a mistrial. The second trial in April 2018 lasted 6 days.

Was it a bench or jury trial? Jury.

15. **Judicial Disqualification.** Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from participation in this appeal? If so, which Justice?

N/A.

TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

16.	Date	of	entry	of	written	jud	lgment	or	ord	er	appeal	led	f	rom:
-----	------	----	-------	----	---------	-----	--------	----	-----	----	--------	-----	---	------

The Order on Plaintiffs' Motion for Entry of Judgment was filed on November 28, 2018. (**Exhibit 3**).

The Judgment Upon the Jury Verdict was filed on December 17, 2018. (Exhibit 4).

If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review:

17. Date written notice of entry of judgment or order was served:

The Notice of Entry of the Order on Plaintiffs' Motion for Entry of Judgment was filed on November 28, 2018. (Exhibit 3).

The Notice of Entry of the Judgment Upon the Jury Verdict was filed on January 2, 2018. (Exhibit 4).

/fax
dling the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment $O(b)$, $S2(b)$, or $S9$
e of motion, the date and method of service of the motion, filing.
Date of filing Date of filing Date of filing

(b) Date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion.

245 P.3d 1190 (2010).

NOTE: Motions made pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration may toll

the time for filing a notice of appeal. See AA Primo Builders v. Washington, 126 Nev. ____,

(c) Date written notice of entry of order resolving tolling motion was served.
Was service by:
☐ Delivery
☐ Mail
19. Date notice of appeal filed: December 18, 2018.
20. Specify statute or rule governing the time limit for filing the notice of appeal, e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other
NRAP 4(a).
SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY
21. Specify the statute or other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review the judgment or order appealed from:
(a)
☐ NRAP 3A(b)(2) ☐ NRS 233B.150
☐ NRAP 3A(b)(3) ☐ NRS 703.376
Other (specify)
(b) Explain how each authority provides a basis for appeal from the judgment or order:
NRAP 3A(b)(1) provides for an appeal of a final judgment.
22. List all parties involved in the action or consolidated actions in the district court:
(a) Parties:
Plaintiff: Aaron Morgan
Defendants: David E. Lujan and Harvest Management Sub LLC
(b) If all parties in the district court are not parties to this appeal, explain in detail why those parties are not involved in this appeal, e.g., formally dismissed, not served, or other:
N/A.

23. Give a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate claims, counterclaims, cross-claims or third-party claims, and the date of formal disposition of each claim.

In his complaint, Morgan alleged three causes of action: (1) negligence against Defendant, David E. Lujan ("Lujan"); (2) negligence per se against Lujan; and (3) vicarious liability/respondeat superior against Defendant, Harvest Management Sub LLC ("Harvest Management"). (**Exhibit 1**). Throughout the litigation, all parties were aware that claims for damages were being pursued against both Defendants. Morgan's claim for vicarious liability was not contested during trial. Harvest Management's NRCP 30(b)(6) witness contested primary liability, but never contested Harvest Management's vicarious liability.

On the final day of trial, the District Court (Judge Linda Bell) sua sponte created a special verdict form that inadvertently included Lujan as the only Defendant in the caption. The District Court informed the parties of this omission, and the Defendants agreed they had no objection. Jury instructions were provided to the jury with the proper caption. The jury used those instructions to fill out the improperly-captioned special verdict form and render judgment in favor of Plaintiff—the jury found Defendants to be negligent and 100% at fault for the accident. As a result, the jury awarded Plaintiff \$2,980,000.

Following trial, Morgan moved the District Court (Judge Elizabeth Gonzalez) to enter its proposed judgment against both Defendants or to make an explicit finding that the omission of Harvest Management from the special verdict was inadvertent and to render judgment in favor of Morgan against both Defendants, jointly and severally. (**Exhibit 2**). The District Court denied Morgan's motion, leaving the judgment only as to Lujan due to the improperly captioned special verdict form. The order denying Morgan's motion was filed on November 28, 2018, and the judgment upon jury verdict was filed on December 17, 2018. (**Exhibits 3** and **4**).

24.	Did	the	judgme	nt or	order	appealed	from	adjudicate	ALL	the	claims
	alleg	ged b	oelow an	d the	rights	and liabilit	ties of	ALL the pa	rties to	the	action
	or c	onso	lidated a	ection	s below	?					

\boxtimes	Yes
	No

25. If	f you	answered	"No"	to	question	24,	compl	lete	the	follo	wing:
--------	-------	----------	------	----	----------	-----	-------	------	-----	-------	-------

- (a) Specify the claims remaining pending below:
 (b) Specify the parties remaining below:
 (c) Did the district court certify the judgment or order appealed from as a final judgment pursuant to NRCP 54(b)?
 Yes
- (d) Did the district court make an express determination, pursuant to NRCP 54(b), that there is no just reason for delay and an express direction for the entry of judgment?

☐ Yes ☐ No

No

26. If you answered "No" to any part of question 25, explain the basis for seeking appellate review (e.g., order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)):

N/A.

27. Attach file-stamped copies of the following documents:

- The latest-filed complaint, counterclaims, cross-claims, and third-party claims
- Any tolling motion(s) and order(s) resolving tolling motion(s)
- Orders of NRCP 41(a) dismissals formally resolving each claim, counterclaims, cross-claims and/or third-party claims asserted in the action or consolidated action below, even if not at issue on appeal
- Any other order challenged on appeal
- Notices of entry for each attached order

Exhibit	Document Description								
1	Complaint (05/20/15)								
2	Motion for Entry of Judgment Without Exhibits (filed 07/30/18)								

Exhibit	Document Description									
3	Notice of Entry with Order on Plaintiffs' Motion for Entry of Judgment (filed 11/28/18)									
4	Notice of Entry with Judgment Upon the Jury Verdict (filed 01/02/19)									

VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read this docketing statement, that the information provided in this docketing statement is true and complete to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I have attached all required documents to this docketing statement.

	Micah S. Echols, Esq.; Thomas W.
	Stewart, Esq.; Benjamin P. Cloward,
Aaron Morgan	Esq.; and Bryan A. Boyack, Esq.
Name of appellant	Name of counsel of record
January 30, 2019	/s/ Micah S. Echols
January 30, 2019	
Date	Signature of counsel of record
Clark County, Nevada	
State and county where signed	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 3	Oth day of January,	2018, I served	d a copy of this
completed docketing statemer	t upon all counsel of	record:	

By electronic service according to the Master Service List:

Douglas Gardner Joshua Gilmore Andrea Champion Dennis Kennedy Sarah Harmon

By mailing it by first class mail with sufficient postage prepaid to the following address(es):

Ara H. Shirinian, Esq. 10651 Capesthorne Way Las Vegas, NV 89135 Settlement Judge

Dated this 30th day of January, 2018.

/s/ Leah Dell

Signature



DISTRICT COURT CIVIL COVER SHEET

County, Nevada

A-15-718679-C VII

Case No.

(Assigned by Clork's Office)

Plaintiff(s) (name/address/phone): Aaron M. Morgan Attorney (name/address/phone): Adam W. Williams Richard Harris Law Frim 801 S. 4th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 H. Nature of Controversy (please select the one most applicable filing type below) Civil Case Filing Types Real Property Landlord/Tenant Other Landlord/Tenant Premises Liability Intentional Misconduct If to Property Other Negligence Malpractice Other Title to Property Other Real Property Other Real Property Other Real Property Other Medical/Dental Other Real Property Condemnation/Eminent Domain Other Malpractice Probate Probate Probate Intentional Misconduct Construction Defect Construction Defect Summary Administration General Administration Special Administration Special Administration Other Construction Defect Contract Case Wental Competency Department of Moore Vehicle Other Probate Probate Contract Case Wental Competency Nevada State Agency Appeal Estate Value Other Probate Other Probate Other Offort Nevada State Agency Other Probate Other Probate Other Offort Nevada State Agency Other Probate Other Probate Other Offort Nevada State Agency Other Probate Other Probate Other Offort Nevada State Agency Other Probate Other Probate Other Offort Nevada State Agency Other Probate Other Probate Other Probate Other Probate Other Offort Nevada State Agency Other Probate Other Probate Other Probate Other Probate Other Offort Vehicle Other Probate Other Proba	eni Sub LLC.
Attorney (name/address/phone): Adarn W. Williams Richard Harris Law Frim 801 S. 4th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 II. Nature of Controversy (please select the one most applicable filing type below) Civil Case Filing Types Real Property Landlord/Tenant Other Torts Unlawful Detainer Other Landlord/Tenant Premises Liability Intentional Misconduct File to Property Other Negligence Malpractice Other Title to Property Idicial Foreclosure Medical/Dental Other Title to Property Under Title to Property Other Real Property Legal Condemnation/Eminent Domain Other Real Property Condemnation/Eminent Domain Other Real Property Construction Defect & Contract Summary Administration General Administration General Administration General Administration Other Construction Defect Summary Administration General Administration Other Construction Defect Set a Side Uniform Commercial Code Nevada State Agency Appeal Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Worker's Compensation	ent Sub LLC.
Adam W. Williams Richard Harris Law Frim 801 S. 4th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 H. Nature of Controversy (please select the one most applicable filing type below) Civil Case Filing Types Real Property Landlord/Tenant Title to Praperty Diher Negligence Diher Torts Didicial Foreclosure Didicial Foreclosure Diher Title to Praperty Diher Real Property Diher Real Property Diher Real Property Diher Real Property Diher Malpractice Probate Probate Probate Diher Malpractice Probate Probate Construction Defect & Contract Didicial Review/Ap Diher Construction Defect Didicial Review Summary Administration Diher Construction Defect Dinicial Review Defences Mediation Case Department of Motor Vehicle Diher Probate Diher Probate Dispartment of Motor Vehicle Diher Probate Dispartment of Motor Vehicle Diher Probate Dispartment of Motor Vehicle Diver Probate	
Adam W. Williams Richard Harris Law Frim 801 S. 4th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 H. Nature of Controversy (please select the one most applicable filing type below) Civil Case Filing Types Real Property Landford/Tenant Differ to Praperty Differ to Praperty Differ Negligence Differ to Praperty Differ Negligence Differ Torts Differ to Praperty Differ Negligence Differ Tort Differ Tort Differ Tort Differ Tort Differ Real Property Differ Real Property Differ Malpractice Differ Real Property Differ Malpractice Differ Real Property Differ Malpractice Differ Solution Defect & Contract Differ Solution Defect Differ Solution Defect Differ Construction Defect Differ Construction Defect Differ Construction Defect Defect Differ Solution Solution Case Defect Solution Solution Defect Differ Construction Defect Defect Solution Solution Solution Defect Defect Solution Solution Solution Defect Defect Solution Solution Defect Differ Construction Defect Defect Solution Solution Defect Solution Defect Solution Solution Solution Solution Defect Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Defect Solution Solut	
Richard Harris Law Frim 801 S. 4th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 H. Nature of Controversy (please select the one most applicable filing type below) Civil Case Filing Types Real Property Landlord/Tenant Other Torts Unlawful Detainer Other Landlord/Tenant Title to Property Indicial Foreclosure Other Negligence Malpractice Other Real Property Other Real Property Condemnation/Eminent Domain Other Real Property Other Malpractice Probate Probate Construction Defect & Contract Summary Administration General Administration General Administration Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Nevada State Agency Appeal Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Uniform Commercial Code Nevada State Agency Appeal Department of Motor Vehicle Worker's Compensation	
Roll S. 4th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101	
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 H. Nature of Controversy (please select the one most applicable filing type below) Civil Case Filing Types Real Property Landlord/Tenant Unlawful Detainer	
Civil Case Filing Types Real Property Landlord/Tenant Other Torts Unlawful Detainer Other Landlord/Tenant Title to Property Other Real Property Construction Defect Probate Probate Probate Construction Defect General Administration General Construction General Construct	
Real Property Real Property Landlord/Tenant Unlawful Detainer Other Landlord/Tenant Premises Liability Other Landlord/Tenant Title to Property Intentional Misconduct Employment Tort Insurance Tort Other Title to Property Other Title to Property Medical/Dental Other Title to Property I Legal Condemnation/Eminent Domain Other Malpractice Probate Construction Defect & Contract Summary Administration General Administration General Administration General Administration Other Construction Defect Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Insurance Carrer Worker's Compensation	
Real Property Real Property Landlord/Tenant Unlawful Detainer Other Landlord/Tenant Premises Liability Other Landlord/Tenant Title to Property Intentional Misconduct Employment Tort Insurance Tort Other Title to Property Other Title to Property Medical/Dental Other Title to Property I Legal Condemnation/Eminent Domain Other Malpractice Probate Construction Defect & Contract Summary Administration General Administration General Administration General Administration Other Construction Defect Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Insurance Carrer Worker's Compensation	
Landbord/Tenant	
Unlawful Detainer Other Landlord/Tenant Title to Property Other Negligence Malpractice Other Title to Property Other Title to Property Other Real Property Condemnation/Eminent Domain Other Real Property Other Malpractice Frobate Probate Construction Defect & Contract Judicial Review/Ap Construction Defect Summary Administration Other Construction Defect Special Administration Other Construction Defect Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Trust/Conservatorship Other Probate Insurance Carrier Product Liability Intentional Misconduct Employment Tori Insurance Carrier Product Liability Intentional Misconduct Insurance Carrier Product Liability Intentional Misconduct Insurance Carrier Product Liability Intentional Misconduct Employment Tori Insurance Carrier Product Liability Intentional Misconduct Employment Tori Insurance Carrier Product Liability Intentional Misconduct Insurance Carrier Worker's Compensation	
Other Landlord/Tenant	
Title to Property	
Judicial Foreclosure	
Other Title to Property	
Condemnation/Eminent Domain	
Condemnation/Eminent Domain Other Real Property Other Malpractice Probate Probate Construction Defect & Contract Judicial Review/Ap Construction Defect Summary Administration Chapter 40 General Administration General Administration Special Administration Contract Case Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate	
Other Real Property	
Probate Construction Defect & Contract Judicial Review/Ap Probate telect case type and estate value) Construction Defect Judicial Review Summary Administration Chapter 40 Foreclosure Mediation Case General Administration Other Construction Defect Petition to Seal Records Special Administration Contract Case Mental Competency Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Nevada State Agency Appeal Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Insurance Carrier Worker's Compensation	
Probate (select case type and estate value) Summary Administration General Administration Other Construction Defect Foreclosure Mediation Case Petition to Seal Records Contract Case Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Worker's Compensation	
Summary Administration General Administration Special Administration Second Administration Second Administration Contract Case Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Foreclosure Mediation Case Petition to Seal Records Mental Competency Mental Competency Nevada State Agency Appeal Department of Motor Vehicle Uniform Commercial Code Worker's Compensation	peal
General Administration Special Administration Special Administration Contract Case Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Trust/Conservatorship Suilding and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Insurance Carrier Worker's Compensation	
Special Administration Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Trust/Conservatorship Other Probate Contract Case Uniform Commercial Code Nevada State Agency Appeal Department of Motor Vehicle Worker's Compensation	
Set Aside Uniform Commercial Code Nevada State Agency Appeal Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Jinsurance Currier Worker's Compensation	
Trust/Conservatorship Building and Construction Department of Motor Vehicle Other Probate Insurance Currer Worker's Compensation	
Other Probate Insurance Carner Worker's Compensation	
Estate Value Commercial Instrument Other Nevada State Agency	
Over \$200,000 Collection of Accounts Appeal Other	
Between \$100,000 and \$200,000 Employment Contract Appeal from Lower Court	
Under \$100,000 or Unknown Other Contract Other Judicial Review/Appeal	
Under \$2,500	
Civil Writ Other Civil Filin	ig.
Civil Writ Other Civil Filing	
Writ of Habeas Corpus Writ of Prohibition Compromise of Minor's Claim	
Writ of Mandamus Other Civil Writ Foreign Judgment	
Writ of Que Warrant Other Civil Matters	
Business Court filings should be filed using the Business Court civil coversheet.	
5/20/15	
Date Signature of initiating party or representati	

See other side for family-related case filings.

28

1 COMP ADAM W. WILLIAMS, ESQ. CLERK OF THE COURT 2 Nevada Bar No. 13617 RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM 801 South Fourth St. 5 Las Vegas, NV 89101 (702) 444-4444 Tel. (702) 444-4455 Fax Email Adam. Williams@richardharrislaw.com 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 AARON M. MORGAN, individually 11 CASE NO.: A-15-718679-C Plaintiff, DEPT. NO.: VII 12 VS. 13 DAVID E. LUJAN, individually; HARVEST COMPLAINT 14 MANAGEMENT SUB LLC; a Foreign Limited-Liability Company; DOES 1 through 20; ROE 15 BUSINESS ENTITIES 1 through 20, inclusive 16 jointly and severally, 17 Defendants. 18 19 COMES NOW, Plaintiff AARON M. MORGAN, individually, by and through his 20 attorney of record ADAM W. WILLIAMS, ESQ. of the RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM, and 21 complains and alleges as follows: 22 JURISDICTION 23 1. That at all times relevant herein, Plaintiff AARON M. MORGAN (hereinafter 24 referred to as "Plaintiff") is, a resident of Clark County, Nevada. 25 2. That at all times relevant herein, Defendant, DAVID E. LUJAN was, and is, a 26 resident of Clark County, Nevada.

RRIS	FIRM
\mathbf{H}_{A}	Α×
4RD	1
CH	
翌.	

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

111

- That at all times relevant herein, Defendant, HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB 3. LLC, was, and is, a foreign limited-liability Company licensed and actively conducting business in Clark County, Nevada
- 4. All the facts and circumstances that gave rise to the subject lawsuit occurred in Clark County, Nevada.
- 5. The identities of Defendant DOES 1 through 20, and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES 1 through 20, are unknown at this time and are individuals, corporations, associations, partnerships, subsidiaries, holding companies, owners, predecessor or successor entities, joint venturers, parent corporations or related business entities of Defendants, inclusive, who were acting on behalf of or in concert with, or at the direction of Defendants and are responsible for the injurious activities of the other Defendants.
- 6. Plaintiff alleges that each named and Doe and Roe Defendant negligently, willfully, intentionally, recklessly, vicariously, or otherwise, caused, directed, allowed or set in motion the injurious events set forth herein.
- 7. Each named and Doe and Roe Defendant is legally responsible for the events and happenings stated in this Complaint, and thus proximately caused injury and damages to Plaintiff.
- 8. Plaintiff requests leave of the Court to amend this Complaint to specify the Doe and Roe Defendants when their identities become known.
- 9. On or about April 1, 2014, Defendants, were the owners, employers, family members and/or operators of a motor vehicle, while in the course and scope of employment and/or family purpose and/or other purpose, which was entrusted and/or driven in such a negligent and careless manner so as to cause a collision with the vehicle occupied by Plaintiff.

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Negligence Against Employee Defendant, DAVID E. LUJAN

- 10. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 9 of the Complaint as though said paragraphs were fully set forth herein.
- Defendant DAVID E. LUJAN owed Plaintiff a duty of care. Defendant DAVID E. LUJAN breached that duty of care.
- 12. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendant, Plaintiff was seriously injured and caused to suffer great pain of body and mind, some of which conditions are permanent and disabling all to her general damage in an amount in excess of \$10,000.00.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION Negligence Per Se Against Employee Defendant, DAVID E. LUJAN

- 13. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 12 of the Complaint as though said paragraphs were fully set forth herein.
- 14. The acts of Defendant DAVID E. LUJAN as described herein violated the traffic laws of the State of Nevada and Clark County, constituting negligence per se, and Plaintiff has been damaged as a direct and proximate result thereof in an amount in excess of \$10,000.00.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION Vicarious Liability/Respondent Superior Against Defendant HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC.

- 15. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 14 of the Complaint as though said paragraphs were fully set forth herein.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes that DAVID E. LUJAN was employed as a driver for Defendant HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC.
- At all times mentioned herein, Defendant HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC.
 was the owner of, or had custody and control of, the Vehicle.
- That Defendant HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC. did entrust the Vehicle to the control of Defendant DAVID E. LUJAN.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2

3

3

7

8

- That Defendant DAVID E. LUJAN was incompetent, inexperienced, or reckless in the operation of the Vehicle.
- 20. That Defendant HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC. actually knew, or by the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that Defendant DAVID E. LUJAN was incompetent, inexperienced, or reckless in the operation of motor vehicles.
- That Plaintiff was injured as a proximate consequence of the negligence and incompetence of Defendant DAVID E. LUJAN, concurring with the negligent entrustment of the Vehicle by Defendant HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC..
- 22. That as a direct and proximate cause of the negligent entrustment of the Vehicle by Defendant HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC. to Defendant DAVID E. LUJAN, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount in excess of \$10,000.00.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 1. General damages in an amount in excess of \$10,000.00;
- 2. Special damages for medical and incidental expenses incurred and to be incurred;
- Special damages for lost earnings and earning capacity;
- 4. Attorney's fees and costs off suit incurred herein; and
- 5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED this 20 day of May, 2015.

RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM

ADAM W. WILLIAMS, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 13617 801 S. Fourth Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorneys for Plaintiff

3	IAFD	
2	ADAM W. WILLIAMS, ESQ.	
_	Nevada Bar No. 13617	
3	RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM	
	801 South Fourth St.	
5	Las Vegas, NV 89101	
6	Tel. (702) 444-4444	
	Fax (702) 444-4455	
7	Email Adam, Williams@richardharristaw.com	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
	DISTRICT	MIDT
9	DISTRICT	OCKI
10	CLARK COUNT	Y, NEVADA
10.		1
11	AARON M. MORGAN, individually	
	Tal. 1200	CASE NO.:
12	Plaintiff,	DEPT. NO.:
13	VS.	
1.2	TNANTEN TO THE EAST COME STANDARD TO THE DATE OF	***************************************
14	DAVID E. LUJAN, individually; HARVEST	INITIAL APPEARANCE FEE
	MANAGEMENT SUB LLC; a Foreign Limited-	DISCLOSURE
15	Liability Company; DOES 1 through 20; ROE	
16	BUSINESS ENTITIES 1 through 20, inclusive jointly and severally,	TOTAL COLUMN TO THE COLUMN TO
	Johnly and severany,	A STATE OF THE STA
17	Defendants.	
18	Defendants.	
1.0	***************************************	
19	D	0 - 0 D10 107 20 - 0 - 1 - 1 0
	Pursuant to NRS Chapter 19, as amended by	Senate Bill 106, filing fees are submitted to
20	norting appropriate in the charge partitled antique as in the	anta il La Jassia
21	parties appearing in the above entitled action as indi	cated below:
	AARON M. MORGAN	\$270.00
22	AMON III. MOROAN	927V,0V
23	TOTAL REMITTED:	\$270.00
		5 m / 6 m / 6
24	DATED this <u>20</u> day of May, 2015.	RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM
25		
win self.		21
26		
		ADĂM W. WILLIAMS
27		Nevada Bar No. 13617
28		801 S. Fourth Street
- ACC.		Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
		Attorneys for Plaintiff
	1	

Exhibit 2

26

27

28

Plaintiff, Aaron M. Morgan, in this matter, by and through his attorneys of record, Benjamin P. Cloward, Esq. and Bryan A. Boyack, Esq., of the Richard Harris Law Firm, and Micah S. Echols, Esq. and Tom W. Stewart, Esq., of Marquis Aurbach Coffing, hereby files Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Judgment. This motion is made and based on the papers and Page 1 of 7

MAC:15167-001 3457380_1

Electronically Filed 7/30/2018 5:13 PM Steven D. Grierson

pleadings on file herein, the attached memorandum of points and authorities, and the oral argument before the Court.

NOTICE OF MOTION

	You	and	each	of	you,	will	please	e take	notice	that	<u>PLA</u>	INTIF	F'S	MO	TIO	N	FOR
ENTR	Y	OF	JUL	GN	MEN	<u>r</u>	will	come	on	regu	ılarly	for	he	earing	g (on	the
04	_ day	of_	Sept.		, 2	018	at the l	nour of	?	9:00	_A:	m. or a	as s	oon	there	eaft	er as
counsel may be heard, in Department 11 in the above-referenced Court.																	

Dated this ____ day of July, 2018.

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

On April 9, 2018, a Clark County jury rendered judgment in favor of Plaintiff, Aaron Morgan ("Morgan"), and against Defendants, David Lujan ("Lujan") and Harvest Management Sub LLC ("Harvest Management"), in the amount of \$2,980,980.00, plus pre- and post-judgment interest. It was undisputed during trial that Lujan was acting within the course and scope of his employment with Harvest Management at the time of the traffic accident at the center of the case. All evidence and testimony indicated Morgan sought relief from, and that judgment would be entered against, both Defendants. However, the special verdict form prepared by the Court (the "special verdict form") inadvertently omitted Harvest Management from the caption, despite Harvest Management being listed on the pleadings and jury instructions upon which the jury

¹ See Special Verdict, attached as Exhibit 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

relied when reaching the verdict itself. The Court acknowledged this omission, and Defendants conceded they had no objection to it. Accordingly, Morgan respectfully requests this Court enter judgment against both Defendants, in accordance with the jury instructions, pleadings, testimony, and evidence, either by (a) simply entering the proposed judgment attached hereto or, (b) by making an explicit finding that the judgment was rendered against both Defendants pursuant to NRCP 49(a) and then entering judgment accordingly.2

FACTUAL BACKGROUND II.

On April 1, 2014, Morgan was driving his Ford Mustang north on McLeod Drive in the right lane. Morgan approached the intersection with Tompkins Avenue. At that time, Lujan, who was driving a shuttle bus owned by Harvest Management, entered the intersection driving east from the Paradise Park driveway, and attempted to cross McLeod Drive heading east on Tompkins Avenue. The front of Morgan's car struck the side of Defendants' bus in a major collision resulting in total loss of Morgan's vehicle and serious bodily injuries. Morgan was transported from the scene of the accident to Sunrise Hospital. The emergency room physicians focused on potential head trauma and injuries to the cervical spine and to Morgan's wrists. Morgan was eventually discharged with instructions to follow up with a primary care physician. A week later, Morgan sought treatment for pain in his neck, lower-back, and both wrists.

Over the next two years, Morgan underwent a series of treatments and procedures for his injuries—including bilateral medial branch block injections to his thoracic spine; injections to ease the pain from his bilateral triangular fibrocartilage tears; left wrist arthroscope and triangular fibrocartilage tendon repair with debridement, incurring approximately nearly \$264,281.00 in medical expenses.

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On May 5, 2015, Morgan filed a complaint for negligence and negligence per se against Luian and vicarious liability against Harvest Management. In jointly answering the complaint, both Defendants were represented by the same counsel and both named in the caption.

See proposed Judgment Upon the Jury Verdict, attached as Exhibit 2.

After a lengthy discovery period, the case initially proceeded to trial in early November, 2017. During the initial trial, Lujan testified that he was employed by Montara Meadows, a local entity under the purview of Harvest Management:

[Morgan's counsel]: All right. Mr. Lujan, at the time of the accident in April of 2014, were you employed with Montara Meadows?

[Lujan]:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Yes.

[Morgan's counsel]: And what was your employment?

[Lujan]:

I was the bus driver.

[Morgan's counsel]: Okay. And what is your understanding of the relationship of Montara Meadows to Harvest Management?

[Lujan]:

Harvest Management was our corporate office.

[Morgan's counsel]: Okay.

[Lujan]:

Montara Meadows is just the local --

[Morgan's counsel]: Okay. All right. And this accident happened April 1, 2014, correct?

[Lujan]:

Yes, sir.3

However, on the third day of the initial trial, the Court declared a mistrial based on Defendants' counsel's misconduct.⁴

Following the mistrial, the case proceeded to a second trial the following April. Vicarious liability was not contested during trial. Instead, Harvest Management's NRCP 30(b)(6) representative contested primary liability—the representative claimed that either Morgan or an unknown third party was primarily responsible for the accident—but did not contest Harvest Management's own vicarious liability.⁵

25

26

27

28

²³ 24

³ Transcript of Jury Trial, November 8, 2017, attached as **Exhibit 3**, at 109 (direct examination of Lujan).

⁴ See Exhibit 3 at 166 (the Court granting Plaintiff's motion for mistrial); see also Court Minutes, November 8, 2017, attached as Exhibit 4.

⁵ See Transcript of Jury Trial, April 5, 2018, attached as Exhibit 5, at 165–78 (testimony of Erica Janssen, NRCP 30(b)(6) witness for Harvest Management); Transcript of Jury Trial, April 6, 2018, attached as Exhibit 6, at 4–15 (same).

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

On the final day of trial, the Court *sua sponte* created a special verdict form that inadvertently included Lujan as the only Defendant in the caption. The Court informed the parties of this omission, and the Defendants explicitly agreed they had no objection:

THE COURT: Take a look and see if -- will you guys look at that verdict form? I know it doesn't have the right caption. I know it's just the one we used the last trial. See if that looks sort of okay.

[Defendants' counsel]: Yeah. That looks fine.

THE COURT: I don't know if it's right with what you're asking for for damages, but it's just what we used in the last trial which was similar sort of.

At the end of the six-day jury trial, jury instructions were provided to the jury with the proper caption.⁶ The jury used those instructions to fill-out the improperly-captioned special verdict form and render judgment in favor of Plaintiff—the jury found Defendants to be negligent and 100% at fault for the accident.⁷ As a result, the jury awarded Plaintiff \$2,980,000.⁸

IV. LEGAL ARGUMENT

This Court should enter the proposed Judgment on the Jury Verdict attached as Exhibit 2—it provides that judgment was rendered against both Lujan and Harvest Management because such a result conforms to the pleadings, evidence, and jury instructions upon which the jury relied in reaching the special verdict.

In the alternative, the Court should make an explicit finding pursuant to NRCP 49(a) that the special verdict was rendered against both Defendants and then enter judgment accordingly. NRCP 49(a) provides, in certain circumstances, the Court may make a finding on an issue not raised before a special verdict was rendered. Indeed, when a special verdict is used, "the court may submit to the jury written questions susceptible of categorical or other brief answer... which might properly be made under the pleadings and evidence." NRCP 49(a). Further, "[t]he court shall give to the jury such explanation and instruction concerning the matter

⁶ See Jury Instructions cover page, attached as Exhibit 7, at 1.

⁷ See Exhibit 1.

⁸ Id.

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

thus submitted as may be necessary to enable the jury to make its findings upon each issue." Id. However, "[i]f in so doing the court omits any issue of fact raised by the pleadings or by the evidence, each party waives the right to a trial by jury of the issue so omitted unless before the jury retires the party demands its submission to the jury. As to an issue omitted without such demand the court may make a finding; or, if it fails to do so, it shall be deemed to have made a finding in accord with the judgment on the special verdict." Id. (emphasis added).

Here, the record plainly supports judgment being rendered against both Defendants. However, should the Court wish to clarify the issue for the record, the Court should make an explicit finding that the omission of Harvest Management from the special verdict was inadvertent and, as a result, that judgment was rendered in favor of Morgan and both against Defendants, jointly and severally.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff Aaron Morgan respectfully requests this Court enter the proposed Judgment on the Jury Verdict attached as Exhibit 2. In the alternative, Plaintiff requests this Court to make an explicit finding that judgment in this matter was rendered against both Defendants and then enter judgment accordingly.

Dated this 30th day of July, 2018.

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

By_{\cdot}	/s/ Micah S. Echols
•	Micah S. Echols, Esq.
	Nevada Bar No. 8437
	Tom W. Stewart, Esq.
	Nevada Bar No. 14280
	10001 Park Run Drive
	Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
	Attorneys for Plaintiff, Aaron M. Morgan

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING 10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 (702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing <u>PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF</u>

<u>JUDGMENT</u> was submitted electronically for filing and/or service with the Eighth Judicial District Court on the <u>30th</u> day of July, 2018. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the E-Service List as follows:⁹

Andrea M. Champion	achampion@baileykennedy.com
Joshua P. Gilmore	jgilmore@baileykennedy.com
Sarah E. Harmon	sharmon@baileykennedy.com
Dennis L. Kennedy	dkennedy@baileykennedy.com
Bailey Kennedy, LLP	bkfederaldownloads@baileykennedy.com
Attorneys for Defendan	t Harvest Management Sub, LLC

Bryan A. Boyack, Esq.	bryan@richardharrislaw.com
Benjamin Cloward	Benjamin@richardharrislaw.com
Olivia Bivens	olivia@richardharrislaw.com
Shannon Truscello	Shannon@richardharrislaw.com
Tina Jarchow	tina@richardharrislaw.com
Nicole M. Griffin	ngriffin@richardharrislaw.com
E-file ZDOC	zdocteam@richardharrislaw.com
Attorneys for 1	Plaintiff, Aaron Morgan

Doug Gardner, Esq.
Douglas R. Rands
Melanie Lewis
Pauline Batts
Jennifer Meacham
Lisa Richardson

dgardner@rsglawfirm.com
drands@rsgnvlaw.com
mlewis@rsglawfirm.com
pbatts@rsgnvlaw.com
jmeacham@rsglawfirm.com
lrichardson@rsglawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendant David E. Lujan

I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and correct copy thereof, postage prepaid, addressed to:

N/A

/s/ Leah Dell Leah Dell, an employee of Marquis Aurbach Coffing

⁹ Pursuant to EDCR 8.05(a), each party who submits an E-Filed document through the E-Filing System consents to electronic service in accordance with NRCP 5(b)(2)(D).

Exhibit 3

		Electronically Filed 11/28/2018 2:46 PM Steven D. Grierson
1	NEOJ	CLERK OF THE COURT
_	DENNIS L. KENNEDY	Alumb. Lin
2	Nevada Bar No. 1462 Sarah E. Harmon	
3	Nevada Bar No. 8106	
4	JOSHUA P. GILMORE Nevada Bar No. 11576	
	ANDREA M. CHAMPION	
5	Nevada Bar No. 13461 BAILEY * KENNEDY	
6	8984 Spanish Ridge Avenue	
7	Las Vegas, Nevada 89148-1302	
	Telephone: 702.562.8820 Facsimile: 702.562.8821	
8	DKennedy@BaileyKennedy.com	
9	SHarmon@BaileyKennedy.com JGilmore@BaileyKennedy.com	
10	AChampion@BaileyKennedy.com	
11	Attorneys for Defendant HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC	
		COLIDE
12	DISTRICT	COURT
13	CLARK COUNT	ΓY, NEVADA
14	AARON M. MORGAN, individually,	Case No. A-15-718679-C
15	Plaintiff,	Dept. No. XI
16	VS.	
17	DAVID E. LUJAN, individually; HARVEST	
18	MANAGEMENT SUB LLC; a Foreign-Limited- Liability Company; DOES 1 through 20; ROE	
	BUSINESS ENTITIES 1 through 20, inclusive	
19	jointly and severally,	
20	Defendants.	
21		
22	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF O	DDED ON PLAINTIEE'S
	MOTION FOR ENTR	
23		
24	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an Order on I	Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Judgment was
25	entered on November 28, 2018.	
26	///	
27	///	
8008		
28	///	
	•	

Case Number: A-15-718679-C

Page 1 of 3

BAILEY * KENNEDY 8984 SPANSH RIDGE AVENUE LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89148-1302 702.562.8820

1	A true and correct copy is attached hereto.	
2	DATED this 28th day of November, 2018.	
3		BAILEY
4		
5		By: <u>/s/ Sarah E. Harmon</u> DENNIS L. KENNEDY
6		SARAH E. HARMON
7		JOSHUA P. GILMORE ANDREA M. CHAMPION
8		Attorneys for Defendants HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC
9		HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

BAILEY * KENNEDY 8984 SPANISH RIDGE AVENUE LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89148-1302

1 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 2 I certify that I am an employee of BAILEY KENNEDY and that on the 28th day of 3 November, 2018, service of the foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT was made by mandatory electronic service through the 4 5 Eighth Judicial District Court's electronic filing system and/or by depositing a true and correct copy 6 in the U.S. Mail, first class postage prepaid, and addressed to the following at their last known 7 address: 8 BENJAMIN P. CLOWARD Email: Benjamin@richardharrislaw.com BRYAN A. BOYACK Bryan@richardharrislaw.com 9 RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM 801 South Fourth Street 10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 11 and 12 MICAH S. ECHOLS Email: Mechols@maclaw.com TOM W. STEWART Tstewart@maclaw.com 13 MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING P.C. 14 1001 Park Run Drive Attorneys for Plaintiff Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 AARON M. MORGAN 15 16 DOUGLAS J. GARDNER Email: dgardner@rsglawfirm.com RANDS, SOUTH & GARDNER 17 1055 Whitney Ranch Drive, Suite 220 Attorney for Defendant Henderson, Nevada 89014 DAVID E. LUJAN 18 19 20 /s/ Josephine Baltazar Employee of BAILEY *KENNEDY 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Electronically Filed 11/28/2018 11:31 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 ORDR Dennis L. Kennedy Nevada Bar No. 1462 Sarah E. Harmon 3 Nevada Bar No. 8106 Joshua P. Gilmore Nevada Bar No. 11576 Andrea M. Champion 5 Nevada Bar No. 13461 **BAILEY** * KENNEDY 6 8984 Spanish Ridge Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89148-1302 7 Telephone: 702.562.8820 Facsimile: 702,562,8821 8 DKennedy@BaileyKennedy.com SHarmon@BaileyKennedy.com JGilmore@BaileyKennedy.com AChampion@BaileyKennedy.com 10 Attorneys for Defendant 11 HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC 12 DISTRICT COURT 13 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 14 AARON M. MORGAN, individually, Case No. A-15-718679-C 15 Dept. No. 🗱 🔨 Plaintiff, 16 17 DAVID E. LUJAN, individually; HARVEST ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR MANAGEMENT SUB LLC; a Foreign-Limited-ENTRY OF JUDGMENT 18 Liability Company; DOES 1 through 20; ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES 1 through 20, inclusive 19 jointly and severally, Date of Hearing: November 6, 2018 Time of Hearing: 9:00 A.M. 20 Defendants. 21 22 On November 6, 2018, at 9:00 a.m., the Motion for Entry of Judgment came before the Court. Tom W. Stewart of Marquis Aurbach Coffing P.C. and Bryan A. Boyack of Richard Harris 23 24 Law Firm appeared on behalf of Plaintiff Aaron Morgan and Dennis L. Kennedy, Sarah E. Harmon, and Andrea M. Champion of Bailey Kennedy appeared on behalf of Defendant Harvest 25 Management Sub LLC. 26 27 /// 28

. r = 98 = 18 x 19 : 41 - RCVD

1	The Court, having examined the briefs of the parties, the records and documents on file, and								
2	having heard argument of counsel, and for good cause appearing,								
3	HEREBY ORDERS that the Motion for Entry of Judgment shall be, and hereby is,								
4	DENIED.								
5	DATED this 26 day of Navewber, 2018.								
6									
7	ENONE								
8	DISTRICT COURT JUDGE								
9	Respectfully submitted by: Approved as to form and content by:								
10	BAILEY * KENNEDY, LLP MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING P.C.								
11	Daniel Mr.								
12	By: MICAH S. ECHOLS MICAH S. ECHOLS								
13	SARAH E. HARMON TOM W. STEWART JOSHUA P. GILMORE 1001 Park Run Drive								
14	ANDREA M. CHAMPION Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 8984 Spanish Ridge Avenue Attorneys for Plaintiff Aaron Morgan								
15	Las Vegas, Nevada 89148 Attorneys for Defendant Harvest Management								
16	$Sub\;LLC$								
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									

Exhibit 4

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Electronically Filed 1/2/2019 11:13 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

AARON M. MORGAN, individually,

DAVID E. LUJAN, individually; HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC; a Foreign Limited-Liability Company; DOES 1 through 20; ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES 1 through 20, inclusive jointly and severally,

Defendants.

Case No .: A-15-718679-C Dept. No.: XI

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

MAC:15167-001 3612459_1

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

1	١
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	۱

28

Please take notice that the Judgment Upon Jury Verdict was filed in the above-captioned matter on December 17, 2018. A copy of the Judgment Upon Jury Verdict is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

Dated this 2nd day of January, 2019.

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

By /s/ Micah S. Echols
Micah S. Echols, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8437
Tom W. Stewart, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 14280
10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
Attorneys for Plaintiff, Aaron Morgan

10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 (702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT was submitted electronically for filing and/or service with the Eighth Judicial District Court on the 2nd day of January, 2019. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the E-Service List as follows:1

Andrea M. Champion	achampion@baileykennedy.com		
Joshua P. Gilmore	jgilmore@baileykennedy.com		
Sarah E. Harmon	sharmon@baileykennedy.com		
Dennis L. Kennedy	dkennedy@baileykennedy.com		
Bailey Kennedy, LLP	bkfederaldownloads@baileykennedy.com		
Attorneys for Defendant Harvest Management Sub. LLC			

Doug Gardner, Esq.	dgardner@rsglawfirm.com		
Douglas R. Rands	drands@rsgnvlaw.com		
Melanie Lewis	mlewis@rsglawfirm.com		
Pauline Batts	pbatts@rsgnvlaw.com		
Jennifer Meacham	jmeacham@rsglawfirm.com		
Lisa Richardson	lrichardson@rsglawfirm.com		
Attorneys for Defendant David E. Lujan			

/s/ Leah Dell

Leah Dell, an employee of Marquis Aurbach Coffing

¹ Pursuant to EDCR 8.05(a), each party who submits an E-Filed document through the E-Filing System consents to electronic service in accordance with NRCP 5(b)(2)(D).



1 **JGJV** Richard Harris Law Firm 2 Benjamin P. Cloward, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 11087 Bryan A. Boyack, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9980 4 801 South Fourth Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 5 Telephone: (702) 444-4444 Facsimile: (702) 444-4455 Benjamin@RichardHarrisLaw.com 6 Bryan@RichardHarrisLaw.com 7 Marquis Aurbach Coffing 8 Micah S. Echols, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 8437 9 Tom W. Stewart, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 14280 10001 Park Run Drive 10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 11 Telephone: (702) 382-0711 Facsimile: (702) 382-5816 RICHARD HARRIS 12 mechols@maclaw.com tstewart@maclaw.com 13 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Aaron M. Morgan 14 15 DISTRICT COURT 16 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 17 AARON M. MORGAN, individually, CASE NO.: A-15-718679-C Dept. No.: XIPlaintiff, 18 19 VS. 20 DAVID E. LUJAN, individually; HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC; a Foreign Limited-JUDGMENT UPON THE JURY VERDICT Liability Company; DOES 1 through 20; ROE 21 BUSINESS ENTITIES 1 through 20, inclusive 22 jointly and severally, 23 Defendants. 24 25 26 27 28

Electronically Filed 12/17/2018 10:00 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COUR

RICHARD HARRIS

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

JUDGMENT UPON THE JURY VERDICT

This action came on for trial before the Court and the jury, the Honorable Linda Marie Bell, District Court Judge, presiding, and the issues having been duly tried and the jury having duly rendered its verdict.2

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that PLAINTIFF, AARON M. MORGAN, have a recovery against DEFENDANT, DAVID E. LUJAN, for the following sums:

\$208,480.00 Past Medical Expenses Future Medical Expenses +\$1,156,500.00 +\$116,000.00 Past Pain and Suffering Future Pain and Suffering +\$1,500,000.00

Total Damages \$2,980,980.00

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that AARON M. MORGAN's past damages of \$324,480 shall bear Pre-Judgment interest in accordance with Lee v. Ball, 121 Nev. 391, 116 P.3d 64 (2005) and NRS 17.130 at the rate of 5.00% per annum plus 2% from the date of service of the Summons and Complaint on May 28, 2015, through the entry of the Special Verdict on April 9, 2018:

PRE-JUDGMENT INTEREST ON PAST DAMAGES:

05/28/15 through 04/09/18 = \$65,402.72

[(1,051 days) at (prime rate (5.00%) plus 2 percent = 7.00%) on \$324,480 past damages]

[Pre-Judgment Interest is approximately \$62.23 per day]

PLAINTIFF'S TOTAL JUDGMENT

Plaintiff's total judgment is as follows:

Total Damages: \$2,980,980.00

Prejudgment Interest: \$65,402.72

TOTAL JUDGMENT \$3,046,382.72

¹ This case was reassigned to the Honorable Elizabeth Gonzalez, District Court Judge, in July 2018.

² See Special Verdict filed on April 9, 2018, attached as Exhibit 1.

Now, THEREFORE, Judgment Upon the Jury Verdict in favor of the Plaintiff is as 2 follows: PLAINTIFF, AARON M. MORGAN, is hereby awarded \$3,046,382.72 against 3 DEFENDANT, DAVID E. LUJAN, which shall bear post-judgment interest at the adjustable 4 legal rate from the date of the entry of judgment until fully satisfied. Post-judgment interest at 5 the current 7.00% rate accrues interest at the rate of \$584.24 per day. 6 Dated this 3 day of 00., 2018. 7 8 9 COURT JUDGE 10 11 12 13 Respectfully Submitted by: Dated this 12 day of December, 2018. 14 15

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

By

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23.

24

25

26

27

28

Micah S. Echols, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 8437 Tom W. Stewart, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 14280 10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Aaron M. Morgan

[CASE NO. A-15-718679-C—JUDGMENT UPON THE JURY VERDICT]

IZALEZ

Exhibit 1

	0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			
	FILED IN OPEN COURT STEVEN D. GRIERSON DISTRICT COURT APR - 9 2010			
1	DISTRICT COURT BY APR 9 2018			
2	11 FHIMM 16.			
3	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA			
4	CASE NO: A-15-718679-C			
5	DEPT. NO: VII			
6	AARON MORGAN,			
7	Plaintiff,			
8	vs.			
9	1			
10	DAVID LUJAN,			
11	,			
12	Defendant.			
13	ī			
14	SPECIAL VERDICT			
15	We, the jury in the above-entitled action, find the following special verdict on the			
16	questions submitted to us:			
17	QUESTION NO. 1: Was Defendant negligent?			
18	ANSWER: Yes No			
19	If you answered no, stop here. Please sign and return this verdict.			
20	If you answered yes, please answer question no. 2.			
21				
22	QUESTION NO.2: Was Plaintiff negligent?			
23	ANSWER: Yes No			
24	If you answered yes, please answer question no. 3.			
25	If you answered no, please skip to question no. 4.			
26	A – 16 – 718679 – C SJV Special Jury Verdict			
27	4738215			
20				

1	QUESTION NO. 3: What per	rcentage of fault do you	assign to each party?		
2	Defendant:	100	·		
3	Plaintiff: _	0			
4	Total: 10	00%			
5	Please answer question 4 withou	ut regard to you answer	to question 3.		
6	QUESTION NO. 4: What an	nount do you assess as	s the total amount of Plaintiff's damages?		
7	(Please do not reduce damages based on your answer to question 3, if you answered question 3.				
8	The Court will perform this task.)				
9			1 008 HOD 00		
10	Past Medical Exp	•	\$ 200, 780.		
11	Future Medical I	Expenses	s.1, 156,500.		
12	Past Pain and Su	ıffering	s 1, 156, 500. 00 s 1, 156, 500. 00 s 116,000, 00		
13	Future Pain and	Suffering	\$ 1,500,000. \$ 2,980,980.		
14	TOTAL		2 980, 980, 00		
15	TOTAL		<u></u>		
16	DATED this 9th day of April,	2018			
17.	any or riprii,		, , O		
18		COA	+ 1/1 /2 +		
19		FOREPE	RSON		
20		ART	HUR J. ST. LANRENT		
21					
22	*				
23					
24					
25					
26 27					
91					