

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA**

DEBRA S. STEWART

Appellant,

v.

MARY VALLINE

Respondent.

Electronically Filed
Apr 16 2025 03:33 PM
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

SUPREME COURT CASE NO. 88999

Appeal from the Judgment
Civil Case No. CV21-00915
Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, Washoe County
Honorable Tammy M. Riggs, District Judge

RESPONDENT'S ANSWERING BRIEF

McCormick, Barstow, Sheppard,
Wayte & Carruth LLP
Michael A. Pinter
Nevada Bar No. 3789
201 W. Liberty Street, Suite 320
Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone: (775) 333-0400
Facsimile: (775) 333-0412

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

Law Office of Stephen H. Osborne, Ltd.
Stephen H. Osborne
323 Court Street
Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone: (775) 789-4944

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

I. NRAP 26.1 DISCLOSURE

The undersigned counsel of record certifies that the following are person and entities as described in NRAP 26.1(a) and must be disclosed pursuant to that rule. These representations are made so that the Justice of the Court may evaluate any potential conflicts warranting disqualification or recusal.

1. Appellant: Mary Valline, a natural person
2. Attorney of Record for Appellant: Stephen H. Osborne, Esq.
3. Publicly held Companies Associated: None
4. Law Firm appearing in the Court(s) below: Law Office of Stephen H. Osborne, Ltd.

DATED this 16th day of April, 2025.

By: Stephen H. Osborne.
Law Office of Stephen H. Osborne, Ltd.
Stephen H. Osborne
Nevada State Bar No. 4721
323 Court Street
Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone: (775) 789-4944

Counsel for Respondent, Mary Valline

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. NRAP 26.1 DISCLOSURE.....	i
II. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	v
III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
IV. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS.....	1
V. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	5
VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	5
VII. ARGUMENT.....	6
A. <i>The district court properly determined Valline was the prevailing party</i>	6
B. <i>The district court did not abuse its discretion in awarding Valline her attorney fees pursuant to NRS Chapter 18</i>	10
C. <i>There was no interplay between NRCP 68 and NRS 18.010 in reference to the district court's order granting Valline's motion for attorney fees because NRCP 68 was irrelevant to the district court's determination</i>	12
D. <i>The district court was within its discretion to determine the attorney fees amount it awarded to Valline</i>	15
E. <i>The district court's decision to use the "lodestar" method for calculating the attorney fees award to Valline was within its discretion</i>	17
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	19
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

<i>Bevard v. Farmers Ins. Exch.</i> , 127 F.3d 1147 (9th Cir. 1997).....	14
---	----

Nevada Cases

<i>Bowyer v. Taack</i> , 107 Nev. 625, 817 P.2d 1176 (1991).....	7, 12, 13
<i>Brunzell v. Golden Gate Nat. Bank</i> , 85 Nev. 345, 455 P.2d 31 (1969).....	15, 16, 17, 18, 19
<i>Cormier v. Manke</i> , 108 Nev. 316, 830 P.2d 1327 (1992).....	6, 7, 8, 9
<i>Leavitt v. Siems</i> , 130 Nev. 503, 330 P.3d 1 (2004).....	6
<i>McCrary v. Bianco</i> , 122 Nev. 102, 131 P.3d 573 (2006).....	7
<i>Miller v. Wilfong</i> , 121 Nev. 619, 119 P.3d 727 (2005).....	5
<i>O'Connell v. Wynn Las Vegas</i> , 134 Nev. 550, 429 P.3d 664 (Ct.App. 2018).....	17, 18
<i>Palace Station Hotel & Casino v. Jones</i> , 115 Nev. 162, 978 P.2d 323 (1999).....	13, 15
<i>Parodi v. Budetti</i> , 115 Nev. 236, 984 P.2d 172 (1999).....	9
<i>Semenza v. Caughlin Crafted Homes</i> , 111 Nev. 1089, 901 P.2d 684 (1995).....	6
<i>Shuette v. Beazer Homes Holdings Corp.</i> , 121 Nev. 837, 864, 124 P.3d 530, 549 (2005).....	19
<i>Smith v. Crown Financial Service of America</i> , 111 Nev. 277, 890 P.2d 769 (1995).....	10, 11, 12

<i>Thomas v. City of N. Las Vegas</i> , 1 22 Nev. 82, 127 P.3d 1057 (2006).....	6
<i>U.S. Design & Const. Corp. v. Int’l Bhd. Of Elec. Workers</i> , 118 Nev. 458, 464, 50 P.3d 170, 174 (2002).....	9
<i>Valley Elec. Ass’n v. Overfield</i> , 121 Nev. 7, 106 P.3d 1198 (2005).....	8

Rules and Statutes

1951 Nev.Stat., ch. 54, § 1.....	11
1957 Nev.Stats. ch. 91 § 1.....	11
1977 Nev.Stats. ch. 401, § 4.....	11
NRAP 26.1.....	i
NRCP 68.....	5, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15
NRCP 68(f).....	8
NRCP 68(f)(1).....	14
NRS 17.130.....	3
NRS 18.010.....	3, 5,10, 11, 12
NRS 18.010(2).....	11
NRS 18.010(2)(a).....	v, 8, 10, 11, 12
NRS 18.020.....	3
NRS Chapter 18.....	1, 10

Other

Merriam-Webster.com Legal Dictionary.....	14
---	----

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.