

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NONA TOBIN, AN INDIVIDUAL,

Appellant,

v.

JOEL A. STOKES, AN INDIVIDUAL,
JOEL A. STOKES AND SANDRA F.
STOKES, AS TRUSTEES OF
JIMIACK IRREVOCABLE TRUST,
AND JIMIACK IRREVOCABLE
TRUST,

Respondents,

Electronically Filed
Oct 13 2021 04:06 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Supreme Court No. 82294
District Court Case No. A-19-
799890-C

**Appellant's Motion to Extend Time to File Appellant Nona Tobin's
Opposition to Respondents' Joint Motion to Strike Appendix and Opposition
to Motion to Strike**

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

COMES NOW, Appellant NONA TOBIN, by and through her attorney, JOHN W. THOMSON, ESQ. of THOMSON LAW PC, and hereby submits this Motion to Extend Time to File Appellant Nona Tobin's Opposition to Respondents' Joint Motion to Strike Appendix and Opposition to Motion to Strike. This Motion is based on the pleadings and papers on file with the Court, and the Points and Authorities attached.

DATED this 13th day of October, 2021.

THOMSON LAW PC

/s/ John W. Thomson _____
JOHN W. THOMSON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 5802
2450 St. Rose Pkwy, Ste 120
Henderson, NV 89074
Attorney for Appellant Nona Tobin

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION

Appellant hereby moves to extend the due date for Appellant Nona Tobin's Opposition to Respondents' Joint Motion to Strike Appendix that was due on October 11, 2021, and filed on October 12, 2021, and rescheduling it to October 13, 2021 or to a date that the Court deems proper, due to the mistake of calendaring because of the federal holiday of Columbus Day October 11, 2021.

II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

NRAP 26(b)(1)(A) states: “**(b) Extending Time. (1) By Court Order (A)** For good cause, the court may extend the time prescribed by these Rules or by its order to perform any act, or may permit an act to be done after that time expires.” Nona Tobin has good cause under the rules for the Court to Order an extension of time for her to file her Opposition Brief.

This Court has discretion to extend the time for Ms. Tobin to file her Opposition to Respondents' Joint Motion to Strike Appendix. Ms. Tobin has good cause for an extension of time: 1) Due to a calendaring error, the Opposition deadline was calendared for October 12, 2021, the actual date that the Opposition was filed. Because the Opposition should have been filed on October 11, 2021, but wasn't because October 11, was a Federal holiday, the date for filing the Opposition was mistakenly set for October 12, 2021, one day late; 2) The Opposition Brief was filed

on October 12, 2021, but was rejected by the Court due to the one-day-late filing. As such, this Motion to Extend Time, and Order Granting Leave to File Opposition after the deadline, is necessary to allow the Clerk of Court to accept the Opposition Brief for consideration by the Court.

Appellant respectfully requests a two-day extension of time until October 13, 2021 in order to file the Opposition.

III. Conclusion

WHEREFORE, Appellant Nona Tobin by and through her attorney of record, John W. Thomson, respectfully asks this Court to enter an order granting her an extension of time to file her Opposition to Respondents' Joint Motion to Strike Appendix at the earliest date by October 13, 2021.

Dated this 13th day of October, 2021.

THOMSON LAW PC

By: /s/ John W. Thomson
JOHN W. THOMSON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 5802
2450 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 120
Henderson, Nevada 89074
*Attorney for Appellant Nona
Tobin as an individual*

THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NONA TOBIN,

Appellant,

v.

BRIAN CHIESI, an individual; DEBORA CHIESI, an individual; QUICKEN LOANS, INC.; JOEL A. STOKES, an individual; JOEL A. STOCKS and SANDRA F. STOKES as Trustees of the JIMI JACK IRREVOCABLE TRUST; REDROCK FINANCIAL SERVICES; and NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC,

Respondents.

Case No.: 82294

Dist. Court No.: A-19-799890-C

APPEAL

From the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County Nevada
The Honorable Susan Johnson, Department XXII, District Court Judge
District Court Case No. A-19-799890-C

**APPELLANT NONA TOBIN'S OPPOSITION TO
RESPONDENTS' JOINT MOTION TO STRIKE APPENDIX**

JOHN W. THOMSON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 5802
THOMSON LAW PC
2450 St. Rose Pkwy, Ste 120
Henderson, NV 89074
Tel: 702-478-8282
Fax: 702-541-9500

Attorney for Appellant Nona Tobin

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. Introduction

The Court should deny Respondents' Joint Motion to Strike Appendix because all of Appellant's Appendix is necessary for this Court to determine whether the district Court erred in granting a motion to dismiss based on *res judicata*. For this Court to resolve whether the district court improperly applied the doctrine of *res judicata*, claim preclusion, and nonmutual claim preclusion to the case at issue, Eighth District Court Case No. A-19-799890-C, Appellant's Appendix requires inclusion of the material documents (Volumes 1-15: AA0001-AA3106, and Volume 16, Nos.1-7: AA3107-AA3227) from the prior Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A-15-720032-C (hereinafter the "First Action"), which was consolidated with Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A-16-730078-C. Appellant subsequently brought Case No. A-19-799890-C (hereinafter the "Second Action") which the district court dismissed pursuant to the doctrine of *res judicata*.

Appellant Nona Tobin's (hereinafter "Appellant") issues on appeal respectfully requests this Court's reversal of Respondent's Red Rock Financial Services' Motion to Dismiss (AA3257-AA3776), and Joinders thereto by Respondents' Brian Chiesi, Debora Chiesi, Quicken Loans Inc. (collectively, the "Chiesi Defendants" joinder: AA3801-AA3812), and Joel A. Stokes, individually, Joel A. Stokes and Sandra F. Stokes, as Trustees of the Jimijack Irrevocable Trust,

Jimijack Irrevocable Trust (collectively, the “Jimijack Defendants” joinder: AA3777-AA3800) based on *res judicata*, claim preclusion, and nonmutual claim preclusion and a decision in the First Action. Pursuant to NRAP 30(a), Appellant attempted in good faith to submit a joint appendix with Respondents, however, Respondents would not agree to the material documents necessary for this Court to properly review the lower court’s decision. Therefore, pursuant to NRAP 30(b)(3), Appellant included the First Action in her appendices (Volumes 1-15: AA0001-AA3106, and Volume 16, Nos.1-7: AA3107-AA3227) to ensure that this Court would properly have “other portions of the record essential to determination of the issues on appeal.” *See* NRAP 30(b)(3) below.

II. Legal Argument

The Court should deny Respondents’ Motion to Strike portions of Appellant’s Appendix because the documents are necessary for a determination of whether *res judicata* applies. NRAP 30(b)(3) states:

“Appellant’s Appendix. If a joint appendix, is not prepared, appellant’s appendix to the opening brief shall include those documents required for inclusion in the joint appendix under this Rule, **and any other portions of the record essential to determination of issues raised in appellant’s appeal.**”

NRAP 30(b)(3) (emphasis added).

It should first be established that Respondents essentially concede that to a degree, pleadings and documents from the First Action should be included in the

appendix for the present appeal. This is correct because the doctrines of res judicata, claim preclusion, and nonmutual claim preclusion necessitate looking back at the First Action and determining whether the parties and/or claims in the First Action necessitate dismissal of the Second Action. However, Respondents claim *Hooper v. State*, 95 Nev. 924, 926, 604 P.2d 115, 116 (1979) is applicable to their Motion to Strike Appendix. However, the *Hooper* case is distinguishable as appellants in that case attempted to include pictures that were not objected to during trial and not part of the trial court's record. Here, Appellant's appendices Volumes 1-15: AA0001-AA3106, and Volume 16, Nos.1-7: AA3107-AA3227 were part of the trial court's records in the First Action. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests this Court grant inclusion of Appellant's appendices Volumes 1-15: AA0001-AA3106, and Volume 16, Nos.1-7: AA3107-AA3227.

Respondents further cite NRAP 10(a), which states:

“The Trial Court Record. The trial court record consists of the papers and exhibits filed in the district court, the transcript of the proceedings, if any, the district court minutes, and the docket entries made by the district court clerk.”

NRAP 10(a).

Because Appellant's appendices Volumes 1-15: AA0001-AA3106, and Volume 16, Nos.1-7: AA3107-AA3227 were all “papers and exhibits filed in the district court, the transcript of the proceedings, . . . district court minutes, and the

docket entries made by the district court clerk” Appellant respectfully requests this Court grant inclusion of her appendices for consideration.

Respondents’ argument is inconsistent in that it seeks to preclude some of the pleadings from the First Action while at the same time acknowledging that parts of the First Action are necessary. In essence, Respondents argue that the Court should only see what Respondents want it to see. Appellant’s Opening Brief identifies issues on appeal of whether or not Appellant, in her individual capacity, was a party to the First Action, and whether she has valid claims to bring in the Second Action. In support of her arguments, Appellant’s Opening Brief cites numerous pleadings and documents from the First Action showing that she was in fact stricken as a party from the First Action despite the fact that she was a necessary and proper party. Furthermore, Appellant never had her claims adjudicated in the First Action. The documents that Respondents seek to strike are documents which the district court necessarily relied on to erroneously conclude that res judicata applies to Appellant’s claims in the Second Action. Therefore, the Court should deny Respondents’ Joint Motion to Strike.

III. Conclusion

In conclusion, for the reasons stated above, the Court should deny Respondents’ Joint Motion to Strike portions of Appellant’s Appendix as the

documents were necessarily relied on by the district court in dismissing the Second Action based on *res judicata*.

Dated this 13th day of October, 2021.

Respectfully submitted by:

THOMSON LAW PC

/s/John W. Thomson, Esq.

JOHN W. THOMSON, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 5802

2450 St. Rose Pkwy, Ste 120

Henderson, NV 89074

Tel: 702-478-8282

Fax: 702-541-9500

Attorney for Appellant Nona Tobin

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies on October 13, 2021, a true and correct copy of *Motion to Extend Time to File Appellant Nona Tobin's Opposition to Respondents' Joint Motion to Strike Appendix and Opposition to Motion to Strike,* was served via the Court's Eflex service system.

Brittany Wood, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 007562
MAURICE WOOD
8250 W. Charleston Blvd., Ste. 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
bwood@mauricewood.com
*Attorneys for Brian Chiesi,
Debora Chiesi, and Quicken Loans, Inc*

Steven B. Scow, Esq.
Nevada Bar No.. 9906
KOCH & SCOW, LLC
11500 South Eastern Avenue
Ste. 210
Henderson, NV 89052
sscow@kochscow.com
*Attorneys for Red Rock Financial
Services*

Joseph Y. Hong, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 5995
HONG & HONG LAW OFFICE
1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Ste. 650
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
yosuphonglaw@gmail.com
*Attorneys for Joel A. Stokes, an individual;
Joel A. Stokes and Debora Stokes, as
Trustees of the Jimijack Irrevocable Trust*

Melanie D. Morgan, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8215
AKERMAN LLP
1635 Village Center Circle, Ste. 200
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
melanie.morgan@akerman.com
*Attorneys for Nationstar Mortgage
LLC*

/s/ Michelle C. Soto
An employee of the Thomson Law PC