Assessor's Parcel Number: 220-17-710-004

Recording Requested By:

Nevantage Law group

Address: 901 Ryland Street Svite 301

City/State/Zip Peno, NV 89502

Real Property Transfer Tax:

DOUGLAS COUNTY, NV

2014-852779

Rec:\$20.00 Total:\$20.00 **NEVANTAGE**

11/14/2014 09:50 AM

Pgs=7



KAREN ELLISON, RECORDER

Award of Attorneys Fees Costs and Interests

(Title of Document)

This page added to provide additional information required by NRS 111.312 Sections 1-2. (Additional recording fee applies) This cover page must be typed or legibly hand printed.

l	
1	Case No. 13-CV-0220 RECEIVED
2	Dept. No. 1 OCT 2 9 2014 2014 0CT 29 PH 3: 58
ر 4 \	DOUGLAS COUNTY DISTRICT COURT OLERK DISTRICT COURT OLERK DISTRICT COURT OLERK
5	IN THE NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVIADA BY DY DEPUTY
6	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF DOUGLAS
7	
8	MATTHEW GOMEZ,
9	Plaintiff,
10	vs. AWARD OF ATTORNEYS FEES COSTS & INTEREST
11	L.S.A. INC., a Nevada corporation;
12	SIMPLE PUMP COMPANY LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company;
14	and GARY WITTIG, an individual,
15	Defendants.
16	On August 13, 2014, a de novo Short Trial was conducted in the Ninth Judicial District
17	Court of the State of Nevada pursuant to N.J.D.C.R. 28. On August 22, 2014, Judgment was
18	entered for Plaintiff in the total amount of Thirteen Thousand Six Hundred Dollars(\$13,600).
19	
20	On August 29, 2014, counsel for Plaintiff filed Plaintiff's Motion For Attorneys' Fees and
21	Costs. On September 8, 2014, counsel for Defendants filed an Opposition To Motion For
22	Attorney's Fees And Costs. On September 16, 2014, Plaintiff filed Plaintiff's Response To
24	Defendants Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For Attorneys' Fees And Costs.
25	Background
26	This action was arbitrated pursuant to the Ninth Judicial District Court court-annexed
27	arbitration program under N.J.D.C.R. 4, which adopts the Nevada Arbitration Rules(NAR).
28	-1 -

Attorney Charles Cockerill was appointed as Arbitrator. The arbitration hearing was conducted and the Arbitrator issued an Award which is included in the record of this action. In his nine(9) page Award, he concluded that Gary Wittig was the alter-ego of LSA, Inc., and awarded money damages against Wittig and LSA in the sum of Thirteen Thousand Six Hundred Dollars (\$13,600), Three Thousand Dollars (\$3000.00) for automey fees and costs in the sum of Four Hundred Fifty-Nine and 50/100 Dollars (\$459.50). Prior to the hearing Plaintiff made an Offer of Judgment to LSA, Inc., in the sum of \$11,000.00, which was rejected.

On April 10, 2014. Defendants filed a Request For Trial de Novo. The action was scheduled for a de novo Short Trial under N.J.D.C.R. 28, which provides for a binding Short Trial as set forth in the Nevada Short Trial Rules. As noted above, the trial was conducted and judgment was issued in favor of Plaintiff in the sum of Thirteen Thousand Six Hundred Dollars(\$13.600.00). The Court concluded, "Gary Wittig is found to be the alter-ego of LSA, and LSA and Wittig are jointly and severally liable for damages awarded to Plaintiff against LSA."

Discussion

Plaintiff seeks the sum of Nineteen Thousand Two Hundred Fourteen and 58/100

Dollars(\$19,214.58) for attorneys' fees and Twenty-Seven and 98/100 Dollars(\$27.98) for costs commencing from the date of the trial de novo request. The request for attorneys fees is supported by a Memorandum of Attorneys' Fees. The request for attorney's fees addresses each of the *Beattie* factors in determining if an award of such fees is merited in this case.

Beattie v. Thompson, 99 Nev, 579, 588-89 (1983). Further, Plaintiff addresses the Brunzell factors as to whether the fees sought are reasonable and justified in the amount. Brunzell v. Golden Gate Nat'l Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 350 (1969).

Counsel for Defendants acknowledges that Plaintiff is the prevailing party in this action and does not oppose an award of attorney's fees, costs and interest. However, the amount of attorney's fees to be awarded is in dispute. Plaintiff has cited several rules and statutes in support of the attorney's fees request. *NAR* 20(B)(2)(a), *NAR* 20(B)(1), *NRCP* 68, *NRS* 18.010(2)(a), *NRS* 18.010(2)(b). In its opposition, Defendants contend those rules and statutes are not applicable in the instant action because the maximum amount of attorney's fees allowable under the Short Trial Rules is Three Thousand Dollars(\$3000.00). *N.S.T.R.* 27(b)(4). The Short Trial Rule states that "an award of fees under subsections (1) (b) of this rule may not exceed a total of \$3000.00, unless the parties otherwise stipulate or the attorney's compensation is governed by a written agreement between the parties allowing a greater award." As noted by Defendants, there is no stipulation or written agreement governing attorney's fees.

It appears that the maximum amount of attorney's fees allowable in this action may be limited by the Short Trial Rules to \$3000.00, unless such fees are merited under NRS 18.010(2)(b):

NRS 18.010 Award of attorney's fees.

- 2. In addition to the cases where an allowance is authorized by a specific statute, the court may make an allowance of attorney's fees to a prevailing party;...
- (b) Without regard to the recovery sought, when the court finds that the claim, counterclaim, cross-claim or third party complaint or defense of the opposing party was brought or maintained without reasonable ground or to harass the prevailing party. The court shall liberally construe the provisions of this paragraph in favor of awarding attorney's fees in all appropriate situations. It is the intent of the Legislature that the court award attorney's fees pursuant to this paragraph and impose sanctions pursuant to Rule 11 of the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure in all appropriate situations to punish for and deter frivolous or vexatious claims and defenses because such claims and defenses overburden limited judicial resources, hinder the timely resolution of meritorious claims and increase the costs of engaging in business and providing professional services to the public.

Counsel for Defendants states, "...regardless of whether NRS 18.010(2)(b) serves as a

basis for awarding attorney's fees under the circumstances of this case (which defendants strenuously reject), the amount of fees awarded is still subject to the limiting provisions of NAR 16(E) and N.S.T.R. 27(b)(4)". Whether attorney's fees may be awarded independent of a limiting statute or rule has been addressed by the Nevada Supreme Court. *Panicaro* v. *Robertson*, 113 Nev, 667, 669 (1997). In *Panicaro*, the non-prevailing party argued that the prevailing party was limited to a maximum award of attorney's fees of \$3000.00, as provided at that time in NAR 20. The Court rejected the argument stating,

"First, the \$3000.00 cap applies only to mandatory fees required under Rule 20. Rule 20 does not restrict the district court's jurisdiction to award discretionary fees under NRS 18.010(2). Secondly, the plain language of NRS 18.010(2) expressly states: In addition to the cases where an allowance is authorized by a specific statute, the court may make an allowance of attorney's fees to a prevailing party. (Emphasis added.) Therefore, we conclude that lower courts are empowered to exceed statutory caps on attorney's fees pursuant to a discretionary award under NRS 18.010." Id.

THEREFORE, the Court hereby enters the following:

Findings of Fact

- 1. Plaintiff Matthew Gomez is the prevailing party in this action and he is entitled to attorney's fees, costs and interest.
- 2. As shown by the "Findings of Fact" in the Judgment, Defendant Gary Wittig as the alter-ego of Defendant LSA, Inc., intentionally and purposefully thwarted and impeded Plaintiff's legitimate and reasonable claim to compensation in the sum of \$13,600.00.
- Wittig has continued his attempts to evade compensating Plaintiff during the litigation of this action including the arbitration process and trial de novo.
- 4. There was no factual or legal basis for Wittig to deny the compensation to Plaintiff because as Wittig candidly testified during the trial, "I was LSA. LSA was me."

Conclusions of Law

- 1. Plaintiff is the prevailing party in this action pursuant to the Nevada Short Trial Rules and NRS 18.010(2)(b).
- 2. Under NRS 18.010(2)(b), Wittig's defense was brought or maintained without reasonable ground and to harass prevailing party Mathhew Gomez.
- 3. Wittig's frivolous and vexatious conduct unreasonably hindered the timely resolution of a meritorious claim.
- 4. Based on the Findings of Fact herein and the *Pinicaro* decison. Plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees independent of the \$3000.00 cap set forth in the Nevada Short Trial Rules.
- 5. The Court is empowered to exceed the aforesaid attorney fee cap and to make a discretionary award of fees under NRS 18.010(2)(b).
- 6. As envisioned by the Nevada Legislature in enacting NRS 18.010(2)(b), this action presents an "appropriate situation" to award discretionary attorney's fees to the prevailing party.
- 7. Counsel for Plaintiff have satisfied the factors regarding attorney's fees set forth in the *Beattie* and *Brunzell* cases.

<u>Award</u>

Plaintiff is awarded attorney's fees in the sum of Nineteen Thousand Two Hundred Fourteen and 58/100 Dollars(\$19,214,580), costs in the sum of Twenty-Seven and 98/100 Dollars(\$27.98) and interest on the judgment at the rate of 5.25%. Wittig and LSA are jointly and severally liable for said fees, costs and interest.

DATED this 29 day of October

NATHAN TOD YOU

District Judge

- 5 -

26

24

25

27

28

\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	~~
1	Copies served by mail this 29 day of October, 2014, to:
2	Nevantage Law Group, Steven G. Ganim, Esq., 401 Ryland St., Ste. 301, Reno, NV 89502;
3	John S. Bartlett, Esq., 755 N. Roop St., Ste. 108, Carson City, NV 89701.
4	Judicial Assistant
5	
6 7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Superior to the state of the st
23	CERTIFIED COPY The document to which this certificate is attached is a
24 25	full, true and correct copy of the original in file and of record in my office.
26	DATE NUMBER OF COURT BOBBIE R. WILLIAMS Clerk of Court
27	of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Douglas, By Deputy