FILED

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

CASE NO. 19229

DEPT. NO. I

•••

189 SEP -6 A11:55

BARBARA REED CLERK BY CLEDEFUTY

IN THE NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NO.____

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF DOUGLAS

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, the duly elected governing body of DOUGLAS COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT

MANFORD E. BEALS, GLEN MULLOWNEY,
KATHERINE MULLOWNEY, THE STATE OF
NEVADA, ex. rel. the Nevada State
Treasurer for the State Distributive)
School Fund, and Does One through
Ten, unknown persons claiming any
right, title, lien, or interest
whatsoever in the real property
described within this Complaint,

Defendants.

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

This case involves an action by Plaintiff Douglas County, (hereinafter "County"), to condemn a certain parcel of real property situated in the Lake Tahoe portion of Douglas County. Named Defendants in the County's complaint were Manford E. Beals, (hereinafter "Beals"), Glen Mullowney, Katherine Mullowney (hereinafter "Mullowneys"), and the State of Nevada, ex. rel. the Nevada State Treasurer for the State Distributive School Fund (hereinafter "State"). Answers were filed by defendants Beals and the State. The matter was set for trial

27 28

28

before a jury. Prior to the date set for trial, Beals filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. The County responded to Beals' motion by filing its own Motion for Summary Judgment. Mullowneys and the State filed no formal written response to either motion, but in open court orally joined in County's motion.

At a hearing held just prior the to scheduled commencement of the jury trial, all parties were present, County being represented by Brent T. Kolvet, District Attorney for Douglas County, State represented by Melanie Meehan-Crossley, Mullowneys represented by Robert M. Henderson and Beals being present in person, representing himself in Forma Pauperis. said hearing, the Court inquired of all parties if they intended to file any further pleadings, motions or responses to motions for summary judgment. All parties responded they did not and the Court then advised the parties that prior to the date set for trial the Court would review the motions and advise the parties if the Court found the motions dispositive of all issues and if a trial was necessary. The Court, after reviewing the Motions for Summary Judgment, notified all parties by telephone that it was vacating the trial as the motions for summary judgment were dispositive of all issues. The Court further advised all parties that it would issue its formal written order.

23

24 25

26 27

28

The motions filed on behalf of Beals and the County present two issues for this Court to consider. The first issue involves whether the use to which the property is to be applied is a public use and whether the property is necessary to such NRS 37.040. Beals asks that summary judgment be public use. entered in his favor on this point because private parties have already constructed some sort of road across the property, somehow negating the public necessity for the condemnation. The County, in its motion, argues that the Court's review of this The thrust of the County's argument is that issue is limited. the Board of Commissioners by passing Resolution No. 87-60 made the necessary and appropriate decisions in this regard and the only consider whether its the Board abused Court can The Court finds the County's argument to be discretion. Schrader v. District Court, 58 Neb. 188, 73 P.2d persuasive. State v. Pinson, 66 Nev. 227, 207 P.2d 1105 493 (1937);(1949); Auoville v. Lincoln Power, 71 Nev. 320, 290 P.2d 970 (1955); Urban Renewal Agency v. Iacommetti, 79 Nev. 113, 379 The Court therefore finds that the Board of P.2d 466 (1963). Commissioners did not abuse its discretion when it found that Beals property was necessary for the purpose of constructing a roadway to serve the Bedell Way area of Douglas County.

The Court now turns to the second issue raised by the motions for Summary Judgment. The County seeks summary judgment on the question of value. In support of its motion, the County has attached the affidavit of Gilbert G. Wright, a qualified

27

28

real estate appraiser. The affidavit of Mr. Wright incorporated by reference a letter of opinion of value. Mr. Wright's opinion of value of the Beals' parcel was set as of August 13, 1987 at \$10,500. Beals offered no responding affidavit contradicting the County's expert. In fact, Beals in his Motion for Summary Judgment argues that no County funds are required be paid to any persons for the taking of the property. Pursuant to NRCP 56(e) the Court, therefore, finds that there is no genuine issue for trial on the question of value.

There being no genuine issue of fact, the Court does hereby order that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment is hereby granted in all respects and Defendant Manford E. Beals' Motion for Summary Judgment is denied.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiff, Douglas County be awarded title to that certain real property situated in the County of Douglas, State of Nevada, more particularly described as follows:

All that portion of Malley Bedell Way as shown on that certain Record of Survey, Document No. 44707, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 4, Block 2 of Cave Rock Village Subdivision, recorded the Office of the County Recorder on October 5, 1953, as Document No. 9223 and shown on the referenced Document No. 49' 52" West 52.18 thence South 55 42' 11" West feet; thence North 89 tó a feet point on the Easterly line of U.S Highway 50 as described in Deed recorded March 29, 1953, in Book B-1 of Deeds, at

Page 5; thence along the Easterly line along a curve concave to the Northwest with a radius of 1114.14 feet, a central angle of 1 08'55", and an arc length of 22.33 feet; thence South 89 42'11" East 90.11 feet; thence North 55 49' 52" East 38.31 feet; thence South 55 49' 52", West 34.17 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Containing 3,850 square feet ,more or less.

Title to said property shall be vested in Douglas County in fee simple absolute.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Douglas County pay to the Clerk of the Court the sum of \$10,500 which sum shall be in full payment of all damages sustained by Defendant Manford E. Beals as a result of the taking by Douglas County.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the sum deposited with the Court Clerk be paid to the State Treasurer on behalf of the State Distributive School Fund as partial satisfaction of that certain judgment entered in Case No. 6973 filed in the Ninth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for the County of Douglas and which was recorded as document number 145042 in Book Number 1186 at page 1282 with the Office of the Douglas County Recorder. Beals has admitted in his Answer to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint that said judgment constitutes a valid lien on the subject property.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the easement interest running in favor of Defendants Glen and Katherine Mullowney is also condemned and any such interest shall be extinguished. The County, pursuant to an oral stipulation entered into in open court, shall not be required to compensate Mullowneys for their

i	
1	interest in said property. The Mullowneys as part of said
2	stipulation having agreed to donate any interest they have in
3	said property to Douglas County.
4	DATED this day of August, 1989.
5	
6	Javed Soull
7	DAVID R. GAMBLE District Judge
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	the document to which this as at the second
13	full, true and correct copy of the original on file and or record in my office.
14	DATE: SEAL 14,1989
15	B Neel Clerk of the 94 Judicial District Court
16	The County of Douglas.
17	Deput-
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	- Tangara
2 3	
24	'REQUESTED BY / D A
25	DOUGLAS COUNTY DE LA COUNTY DE LA COUNTY DE LA COUNTY DOUGLAS CO NEVADA
26	
27	789 SEP 18 P3:27
28	SUZANNE BEAUDREAU RECORDER 211097
	SE PAID KIO DEPUTY
	500K 989PAGE2171

3