1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I certify that I am an employee of BAILEY KENNEDY and that on the 2 11th day of February, 2019, service of the foregoing **RESPONDENT** 3 HARVEST MANAGEMENT SUB LLC'S RESPONSE TO DOCKETING **STATEMENT** was made by electronic service through Nevada Supreme 4 Court's electronic filing system and/or by depositing a true and correct copy in 5 the U.S. Mail, first class postage prepaid, and addressed to the following at 6 their last known address: MICAH S. ECHOLS Email: mechols@maclaw.com 7 TOM W. STEWART tstewart@maclaw.com MARQUIS AURBACH **COFFING** Attorneys for Appellant 8 AARON M. MORGAN 1001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 9 BENJAMIN P. CLOWARD Email: BRYAN A. BOYACK Bbenjamin@richardharrislaw.com 10 RICHARD HARRIS LAW bryan@richardharrislaw.com FIRM Attorneys for Appellant AARON M. MORGAN 801 South Fourth Street 11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 12 DOUGLAS J. GARDNER Email: DOUGLAS R. RANDS dgardner@rsglawfirm.com drands@rsgnvlaw.com Brett South 13 RANDS, SOUTH & bsouth@rsgnvlaw.com **GARDNER** 1055 Whitney Ranch Drive, Attorneys for Respondent 14 Suite 220 DAVID E. LUJAN Henderson, Nevada 89014 15 Ara H. Shirinian Email: arashirinian@cox.net 10651 Capesthorne Way 16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135 Settlement Program Mediator 17 /s/ Susan Russo_ Employee of BAILEY **❖** KENNEDY

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO DOCKETING STATEMENT

A. <u>Statement of the Case:</u> Morgan abandoned any and all claims against Harvest during trial. He failed to prove any claim against Harvest, and he failed to present any claim against Harvest to the jury for determination.

Morgan did not allege a claim for vicarious liability against Harvest. He pled a claim for negligent entrustment. No claim for vicarious liability was tried to the jury. No evidence was offered at trial to prove a claim for vicarious liability — particularly as to the essential element of the employee acting within the course and scope of his employment. Moreover, the undisputed evidence at trial demonstrated that the employee was at lunch at the time of the accident. Thus, under the coming and going rule, Harvest cannot be vicariously liable.

The jury's verdict is not the result of an alleged "clerical error" in the caption of the special verdict form. The jury did not render a verdict against Harvest because Morgan failed to present a claim against Harvest to the jury for determination. Morgan made a voluntary and intentional decision to exclude any claim against Harvest from the jury's determination, as demonstrated by the lack of evidence offered against Harvest at trial, the lack of jury instructions pertaining to any claim against Harvest, and Morgan's explanation of the verdict form to the jury in closing arguments. Thus, the district court denied Morgan's Motion for Entry of Judgment against Harvest.

B. <u>Issues on Appeal:</u> Morgan never requested that Judge Elizabeth Gonzalez transfer the case back to Judge Linda Bell for determination of any of the post-trial issues on appeal. Therefore, the issue of whether or not Judge Gonzalez should have granted such relief is not a proper issue on appeal.