The document to which this certific 4 ed is a full, true and correct copy of the original on file and of record in my office. Case No.: 01-SC-0032 1 Clerk of the Tahoe Township Justice Court Date County of Douglas, State of Nevada (SEAL) 2 01 OCT 10 PM 4: 52 3 TAHOE TOWN**SHI**P JUSTICE COURT 4 IN THE JUSTICE COURT OF TAHOE TOWNSHIPERK 5 6 COUNTY OF DOUGLAS, STATE OF NEVADA 7 JAMES C. JORDAN, 8 JUDGMENT 9 Plaintiff, 10 ANTHONY ELIAS and JOAN ELIAS. 11 12 Defendant. 13 BE IT REMEMBERED that this Small Claims matter came on regularly for trial on October 9, 14 2001. Plaintiff, Defendants and witness Gerry Nott were sworn and testified, and both parties submitted 15 documentary evidence. Whereupon, the matter was submitted to the Court for decision. 16 Plaintiff and Defendants were next-door neighbors in Zephyr Heights. Plaintiff owned Lot 5, 17 Block 3, and Defendants own Lot 4, Block B. The parties' respective properties are served by a common 18 easement. Pursuant to a recorded easement document the "owners of Lot 4 and 5 agree [d] to share equal 19 responsibility for maintaining said easement; that they have a 50/50 liability in the maintenance, snow removal and any other costs incurred on the said easement". 20 21 In the spring of 2000, plaintiff perceived that repairs were necessary to the retaining wall protecting the common driveway. Plaintiff approached defendant Anthony Elias with his plan to have the 22 23 retaining wall replaced. Plaintiff obtained bids for the replacement of the wall, shared the bids with 24 defendant, engaged the contractor and paid for the repairs when they had been completed. Defendants did 25 not reimburse plaintiff for any of the repairs. St. Minden NV 89423 26 27 28 <sup>1</sup> Exhibit 1, Page 7. 0532821 BK0102PG5999 JUDGMENT - 1

Prior to this suit, and in an effort to buy the defendants peace from plaintiff's demands for payment, defendants agreed to pay the plaintiff one-half of the cost of the retaining wall. Defendants acknowledged that this payment was due, apologized for their delay in payment of this amount<sup>2</sup>. Defendants later changed their minds and refused to pay.

Plaintiff acted appropriately in obtaining bids and soliciting defendants' agreement to the work before committing for this improvement. Defendants cannot go back on their agreement to reimburse; defendants financial ability to pay is not relevant to their "50/50 liability for maintenance... or any other costs" associated with the easement.

However, the Court must view the interpretation of the language "any other costs" reasonably. The cost of landscaping the hill above the retaining wall is not a reasonable cost. Plaintiff has not carried his burden of proof relative to any promise of the defendants to reimburse plaintiff for landscaping, and the defendants have not benefited from the landscaping as they have failed and refused to maintain, or even water, the landscaping.

Plaintiff shall recover one-half of the cost of the retaining wall improvement<sup>3</sup>. Judgment is entered in favor of plaintiff in the amount of \$2296.00, plus costs of \$95.00.

Dated this

day of <u>M</u>

2001.

RICHARD GLASSON JUDGE
Tahoe Township Justice Court

<sup>2</sup> Exhibit 1, Page 6.

<sup>3</sup> \$2296.00 (\$4592.00 x .5), Exhibit 1, Page 2.

BK0102PG6000

Brooke Shaw example of DOUGLAS CO. HEVADA

2002 JAN 22 PM 1: 00

LINDA SLATER RECORDER