



NEVADA LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S SUBCOMMITTEE
TO STUDY THE BENEFITS, COSTS, AND FEASIBILITY OF
THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COURTS OF CHANCERY
(Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 35, File No. 109, *Statutes of Nevada 2007*)

SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT

The first meeting of the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Study the Benefits, Costs, and Feasibility of the Implementation of Courts of Chancery was held on January 29, 2008, at 9 a.m. in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, and Room 124 of the Greenhaw Technical Arts Center, Great Basin College, 1500 College Parkway, Elko, Nevada. A copy of this set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report," including the "Meeting Notice and Agenda" ([Exhibit A](#)) and other substantive exhibits, is available on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/Interim. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775/684-6835).

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Senator Bob Beers, Chairman
Senator Terry Care
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT IN ELKO:

Assemblyman John C. Carpenter

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER EXCUSED:

Assemblyman William C. Horne

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU (LCB) STAFF PRESENT:

Jennifer Chisel, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division
Kevin C. Powers, Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Bryan Fernley-Gonzalez, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Lucinda Benjamin, Senior Research Secretary, Research Division

OPENING REMARKS

Senator Bob Beers, Chairman, welcomed members, presenters, and the public to the first meeting of the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Study the Benefits, Costs, and Feasibility of the Implementation of Courts of Chancery. Chairman Beers introduced Subcommittee members and staff. He explained the legislative history of the Subcommittee; recommendations made to the 2001 Legislature from the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Study Methods to Encourage Corporations and Other Business Entities to Organize and Conduct Business in this State (S.C.R. 19, File 144, *Statutes of Nevada* 1999), [Exhibit B](#); Rules of Practice for the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, Rule 1.61 "Assignment of business matters," [Exhibit C](#); and Rules of Practice for the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, Rule 2.1 "Business court docket," [Exhibit D](#).

OVERVIEW OF A.C.R. 35 CREATING THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY THE BENEFITS, COSTS, AND FEASIBILITY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COURTS OF CHANCERY IN NEVADA

- Jennifer Chisel, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB, provided an explanation of A.C.R. 35 of the 2007 Legislative Session that directs the Subcommittee to study the benefits, costs, and feasibility of the implementation of courts of chancery in the State of Nevada. She outlined the responsibilities of the Subcommittee as: (1) a compilation and analysis of the economic and legal impact to other states that currently have chancery courts; and (2) an assessment of expected revenues, estimated costs of operation, and ancillary economic impact to Nevada that might result from the implementation of a chancery court. She noted that a final report will be submitted to the Legislative Commission and that the Subcommittee may submit up to five bill draft requests by July 1, 2008, to the 2009 Legislature.

PUBLIC COMMENT

(As directed by Chairman Beers, this agenda item was taken out of order.)

- Ross Miller, Secretary of State, Office of the Secretary of State, said implementing an institutionalized business court is very important to increase commercial recordings revenue and foster economic development in Nevada. He stated he had visited Delaware to examine their commercial recordings process and in particular their chancery court. He was of the opinion that Nevada has an up-to-date commercial filing process, which is more advanced than Delaware's system; however, Delaware has a long-standing chancery court. He stated a positive for Nevada is the 315,000 entities on file in the Commercial Recordings Division that results in \$90 million in general revenue for the State. He said Nevada is second in the nation for the number of commercial filings per capita, which makes it the second best jurisdiction in the nation to base commercial operations.

Mr. Miller explained to the Subcommittee that Delaware's distinguishing factor is primarily the fact it has a long-standing business court, which is a significant advantage, and receives approximately one-third of its general revenue from its Commercial Recordings Division. Based on the large potential advantages for Nevada, Mr. Miller encouraged the Subcommittee to study the issue of implementing an institutionalized business court.

PRESENTATION REGARDING NEVADA'S COURT SYSTEM

- Ron Titus, Court Administrator and Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court, referred to the "Annual Report of the Nevada Judiciary for Fiscal Year 2007" ([Exhibit E](#)) and the "Annual Report of the Nevada Judiciary for Fiscal Year 2006" ([Exhibit F](#)) and introduced A. William Maupin, Justice, Nevada Supreme Court.
- Justice Maupin told the Subcommittee that Mark Gibbons, Chief Justice, Nevada Supreme Court, intended to testify at the meeting but due to a scheduling conflict was unable to attend. Justice Maupin explained that prior to Chief Justice Gibbons becoming a Clark County District Court judge in 1997, he spent over 20 years as a commercial litigator, primarily operating in the Eighth Judicial District. Consequently, Chief Justice Gibbons has a great interest in the business court concept.

Continuing, Justice Maupin said he made a similar presentation to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary in February 2007 ([Exhibit G](#)). Like other small states nationwide, the *Nevada Constitution* provides two levels of judicial service: (1) trial level; and (2) appellate level. He noted that the trial level has two subcomponents consisting of the justice and municipal courts, which are the courts that have the most contact with the general public. Municipal courts primarily handle criminal cases with jurisdiction solely over misdemeanor offenses. He stated that in Nevada, there are three types of legislatively created criminal misconduct: (1) felonies; (2) gross misdemeanors; and (3) misdemeanors. Municipal courts handle misdemeanor offenses where the offense is alleged to have occurred within an incorporated city limit, such as Boulder City, Henderson, Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Reno, or Sparks. The justice courts have parallel trial jurisdiction over misdemeanors but process the cases that occur outside of incorporated areas.

In addition, Justice Maupin explained that other responsibilities of the justice courts include handling cases where the amount of controversy is less than \$10,000. Justice courts screen major criminal cases, gross misdemeanors, and felonies for ultimate trial in the district court system, the primary general level of the court system. The district court has two levels of jurisdiction that include civil and criminal cases: (1) all civil cases where the amount in controversy exceeds \$10,000; and (2) all criminal cases where a defendant has been bound over for trial in district court for a felony or a gross misdemeanor.

Justice Maupin then explained there are two appeals constructs in Nevada. District courts hear appeals from justice and municipal courts, but the primary appellate court is the Nevada Supreme Court; there is no intermediate appeals court. The Supreme Court handles all appeals in criminal and civil cases from the district court system in Nevada. He stated the *Nevada Constitution* requires the Supreme Court to hear all of the cases on the merits over which the Court has jurisdiction for cases that are timely filed following a final judgment.

Justice Maupin further described the composition and terms of the Nevada Supreme Court justices and stated that approximately 80 percent of the Court's cases are heard in three-judge panels. A full Court includes the judges in the two three-judge panels that sit en banc with the Chief Justice, which handle the primary cases that set precedent—cases of first impression, resolution of conflicting prior precedent, constitutional issues, death penalty cases, major civil cases with complex records, and ballot questions. Under the *Nevada Constitution* the Supreme Court is also the administrative head of the judicial branch of State government and has the power to issue original writs of mandamus, certiorari, prohibition, quo warranto, and habeas corpus. The Court also oversees the licensure and discipline of attorneys and hears appeals from Orders of Discipline from the Judicial Discipline Commission. Justice Maupin explained the funding construct for the Court is 55 percent from General Fund appropriations, 45 percent from administrative assessments, and other fees generating the balance.

In addition, Justice Maupin explained that district courts possess primary jurisdiction for trying major criminal and civil cases and stated the chancery court model would involve the district court's civil jurisdiction. He provided the following statistics:

1. There are nine judicial districts for Nevada's 17 counties with several counties overlapping; the largest district being the Eighth Judicial District in Clark County.
2. Beginning in January 2009, there will be 72 district judges statewide including family judges in the Second and Eighth Judicial Districts. Currently, there are 64 judges throughout the State.
3. The largest number of judges is in the Eighth Judicial District and the second largest is the Second Judicial District in Washoe County where a business court construct was enacted ten years ago.
4. The funding source is primarily from local government with District Court salaries funded by State appropriations. All staff, facilities, and operational expenses are the responsibility of the county's general funds.
5. The caseloads of the district courts are high; the highest in the United States, particularly in Clark County.

Continuing, he explained the total number of filings and cases disposed in Fiscal Years 2005, 2006, and 2007. The total number of civil cases disposed in the nine judicial districts in Nevada increased from 25,065 in 2005 to 28,913 in 2007, which in his opinion is a considerable achievement for the 64 judges statewide.

- In response to a question from Chairman Beers, Justice Maupin explained that the information in his presentation applied to larger civil cases, those over \$10,000, where the District Court has jurisdiction.
- Continuing, Justice Maupin explained the creation of specialty courts and the family divisions of the Eighth and Second Judicial Districts, which have increased the ability of the court system to handle case traffic. This validates the concept of creating a specialty court because it upgrades the efficient management of the court docket and significantly increases access for individuals who need specialty dispute resolution services. He noted that drug and mental health courts were discussed in past legislative sessions. Justice Maupin provided additional information about specialty courts and said when a special category of court management is created then the court system's ability to deliver quality services to the public is increased.

Further, he referred to the committee hearings held during the 1999 Legislature on the business court concept, which played an important role in effecting the business courts into Nevada's court system. The primary witness on behalf of the Supreme Court was then Chief Justice Rose, who talked about the Delaware model of handling business disputes. The goal of the committee was to address legislative policy that encouraged diversification of Nevada's economy and made the State more attractive for business development. Part of the goal was to develop a business-friendly environment similar to other states like Delaware and North Carolina. Justice Maupin stated he joined Chief Justice Rose in the committee hearings to testify regarding the business court concept and at that time to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to create dedicated institutionalized business courts through legislative fiat. He explained that the Supreme Court undertook an experiment using the Supreme Court's inherent Constitutional power to administrate the court system. The result was the promulgation of the Second Judicial District Court Rule 2.1 and the Eighth Judicial District Court Rule 1.61 creating a business court for corporate and business-to-business disputes. This concept has had consistent success in the Second Judicial District and current success in the Eighth Judicial District.

Justice Maupin quoted statements written by District Court Judge Brent T. Adams regarding the background of the business court in the Second Judicial District Court, as follows:

The business court dockets in Nevada were created on the model of business courts in Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina. The purpose of the business court docket is to identify certain classes of commercial litigation to be managed by one judge with

these goals in mind: (1) early comprehensive case management to avoid business interruption during the pendency of the litigation; (2) judicial activism and settlement to promote innovative case resolution; (3) close management of factually or legally complex commercial litigation; and (4) consistency of decision to enable business planning.

Under Chief Justice Rose's stewardship, the Supreme Court started the business court process. It worked well in the Second Judicial District and initially in the Eighth Judicial District. Justice Maupin remarked that there was a loss of energy for the business court in the Eighth Judicial District as a result of a combination of issues that lead to an order by Chief Justice Rose in 2006, which recreated the business court concept in Clark County. Specialty courts were instituted by the Supreme Court in cooperation with the Legislature's statements of public policy without constitutional amendment. The goal was to develop more common law to provide greater predictability and guidance for individuals involved in business litigation disputes and business planning so they could construct agreements that complied with Nevada law. Justice Maupin was of the opinion that it is important to examine the success of the current program and determine, as a matter of public policy, whether to continue with the current construct and apply more resources or proceed with amending the *Nevada Constitution* to create a chancery court.

- Assemblyman Carpenter asked if the Supreme Court would continue to establish business case law or would Justice Maupin recommend an amendment to the *Nevada Constitution*.
- Justice Maupin noted that the Supreme Court is strongly committed to the concept of business courts and said an amendment was not necessary at this time. He pointed out the creation of precedent in commercial litigation is important to the operation of a business court; however, an area that hinders the process is the large caseload of the Supreme Court. Justice Maupin said, in the long-term, the creation of an appeals court would help to reduce the caseload; however, creation of an intermediate appeals court would need to be approved by Nevada voters in a general election, then the issue would need to be approved by the Nevada Legislature prior to being placed on the ballot.
- Senator Care noted that the creation of a chancery court would require an amendment to the *Nevada Constitution* and the operation of the current business court does not require an amendment. He inquired if the Second and Eighth Judicial Districts could expand the current business courts, as needed, as an alternative to establishing a chancery court by amendment.
- Justice Maupin commented that a chancery court is a court of equity and could be designed to create equitable remedies for ongoing disputes in order to facilitate settlements. One of the great successes of recent years has been the family court system, which he explained is also a court of equity.

- In response to an inquiry from Chairman Beers regarding the status of legislative efforts to create an intermediate appellate court, Justice Maupin explained that Senate Joint Resolution No. 9 (File No. 69, *Statutes of Nevada*) passed in the 2007 Legislative Session proposed to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to add an intermediate appeals court to the judicial system. Joint resolutions that seek to amend the *Nevada Constitution* must be passed by two sessions of the Legislature and then submitted to the people of Nevada for a vote. If approved by the voters, the Legislature would create the appellate court, and judges would be elected to take office in 2013.

PRESENTATION REGARDING THE BUSINESS COURT DOCKET IN NEVADA
Overview, Statistics, and Current Status in Washoe County

- The Honorable Brent T. Adams, District Court Judge, Department 6, Second Judicial District Court of Nevada, expressed strong support for the business court as part of civil litigation in Nevada. He added the development of a business court was pioneered by John H. O. LaGatta, a Reno businessman, who garnered support from members of the Nevada Supreme Court and other judges for the concept modeled after business courts in Delaware, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina. He stressed value as the driving force for the creation of a chancery court. Please see [Exhibit H](#).

In Judge Adams' opinion, the value of the business court must be examined, which includes the recognition that civil litigation costs too much and lasts too long and can destroy companies through loss of jobs and elimination of a competitive place in the market causing serious damage to individuals and the business entity. He was of the opinion that two compelling reasons for starting a business court are: (1) uniformity and predictability of decisions; and (2) active early case management to end disputes, so litigation does not destroy the business. He described how a case was quickly disposed by the business court in the Second Judicial District Court and stated that the Court's settlement rate is over 90 percent.

Summarizing, Judge Adams stressed the fact that business courts can provide speedy and inexpensive disposition of cases and urged the Subcommittee to examine the following questions:

1. Is a chancery court necessary and should it be established by amending the *Nevada Constitution*;
2. Should judges be dedicated to the chancery court; and
3. Should civil cases be handled using settlement conferences the same as business cases.

As an example, he explained that in the Washoe County business court if cases cannot be settled the first day, a management plan is immediately developed and provided to all the individuals involved.

Overview, Statistics, and Current Status in Clark County

- The Honorable Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Court Judge, Department 11, Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada, provided information using a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit I](#)) on:
 - Background of the Nevada Business Court;
 - Business court goals;
 - Types of cases and how cases are assigned using Eighth Judicial District Court Rule (EDCR) 1.61 “Assignment of business matters”;
 - Disputes concerning validity, control, operation, or governance of entities, trademarks;
 - Disputes between two business entities where the court determines that the case would benefit from enhanced case management; and
 - Types of cases specifically excluded from business court, under EDCR 1.61(a)(3).

Judge Gonzalez explained that the current business court in the Eighth Judicial District primarily includes disputes relating to governments, business entities, trademarks, trade secrets, securities issues, and complex disputes between businesses. She referred to the proposed changes to EDCR Rule 1.61 to clarify the definitions in the Rule for judges and businesses in order to create predictability. The revision is currently awaiting approval by the Nevada Supreme Court ([Exhibit J](#)).

Continuing, Judge Gonzalez noted the types of cases excluded from the business court are personal injury, products liability, consumer litigation, wrongful termination, and landlord-tenant disputes. She elaborated on the benefits of the business court and said parties in the cases are required to appear for a conference to see if a resolution can be achieved early in the case without expending large sums of money, which are called Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure (NRCPP) 16 Conferences in the Eighth Judicial District Court. In addition, status conferences are scheduled with parties to address management issues that could adversely affect business operations.

Commenting further, Judge Gonzalez referred to EDCR Rule 1.61 and said business court judges are selected based on their specialized experience. She explained that most business court cases are disposed prior to a jury trial and at earlier stages in the cases, if possible. There is also a settlement conference program where cases are shared

between the Eighth and Second Judicial Districts. Judge Gonzalez and the Honorable Mark K. Denton, District Court Judge, Department 13, Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada, handle settlement conferences for each other within the Eighth Judicial District. She commented that through the Administrative Office of the Courts the Second Judicial District Court is used as a resource and vice versa. Judge Gonzalez discussed electronic filing of orders and said the filing facilitates efficient and organized case management and is cost effective in preparing multiple copies of large pleadings ([Exhibit K](#)).

In conclusion, she discussed full civil and criminal caseload statistics and business court caseloads for herself and Judge Denton and said the total number of current pending cases is 506. She explained to effectively serve the needs of the business community caseloads need to be managed efficiently and decisions must be written for predictability, as in other states. With the high caseload in the Eighth Judicial District Court, this cannot be accomplished. She pointed out that judges in Delaware have less than 250 cases each and in North Carolina have less than 100 cases each. The time-to-trial for cases in the Eighth Judicial District Court in 2007 was 24 months compared to 39 for civil cases and 11 for criminal cases.

- Judge Denton noted that District Court Judge Gonzalez is secretary of the American College of Business Court Judges, which serves Nevada well. For instituting a chancery court, in his opinion, discussions are needed to determine:
 1. Should a chancery court be limited to business-type matters or be a full court of equity;
 2. How would the nonbusiness cases of equity be integrated with the business cases, or should they be handled separately;
 3. Where would the court be housed;
 4. How would legal issues be handled that can be tried by a jury as opposed to equity issues that are not; and
 5. How cases would be handled with the Office of the Jury Commissioner.

Judge Denton stated that civil cases deal with business matters as well as other kinds of nonbusiness equity matters including injunctions and nuisance cases. He commented that further study of the implementation of a chancery court is necessary. He noted his business calendar has increased from 2006 to 2007, so in his opinion it appears practitioners are aware of and are using Nevada's business court.

- Chairman Beers discussed the writing of opinions and the amount of time spent on handling business cases.

- Judge Gonzalez stated approximately 50 percent of time is spent on business matters of her shared criminal-civil calendar. The business court cases amount to 25 percent of the caseload and require half of her time.
- Judge Denton said 40 to 50 percent of his time is spent on business court cases.
- Judge Adams noted that about 30 percent of his docket consists of business court cases, and he agreed with Judge Gonzalez that typically business court cases take longer if they involve complex time-consuming matters. He added that the success of a business court depends heavily on the judge's experience and business acumen to create an environment amiable to the lawyers and their clients' companies.
- Chairman Beers questioned if cases could be isolated to the business court and if the court could be completely funded by fees paid by the litigants in order to increase the amount of time district court judges spend on business-type cases and provide an opportunity to develop a written record of opinion and precedent to improve the efficiency in the Second and Eighth Judicial Districts.
- Judge Adams added that a high percentage of cases are settled, so precedents are not set and many disposition decisions are confidential for competitive reasons. He suggested managing judicial personnel to deliver efficient and cost-effective disposition of all types of cases, and he noted that in the Second Judicial District there are judges available to handle business cases if he cannot.
- Senator Care requested staff to gather information on other states' business courts regarding the disposition of cases.
- Chairman Beers added a request for information on the framework of other business courts including: (1) whether other states' business courts were established by state constitutions; (2) what set of rules determine how cases are directed to the courts; and (3) how judges are selected and retained.
- Assemblyman Segerblom questioned how chancery courts publish opinions that become precedents.
- Judge Gonzalez replied that Delaware and North Carolina issue written decisions that are cited by other courts in their jurisdiction and other jurisdictions.

Discussion was held on the length of operation of business courts in Nevada. Judge Gonzalez explained at the onset the Eighth Judicial District Bench Bar Committee suggested there be consistency in the judges for the business courts, so she and Judge Denton agreed to serve for several years.

- Assemblyman Carpenter added that the rural counties need to be included in the discussion in regard to business courts in rural Nevada. Discussion was held on the management of cases in rural areas and transference of cases between district courts.

- Chairman Beers asked that a representative from the Fourth Judicial District, Elko County, be placed on the agenda for a later Subcommittee meeting.
- Judge Denton explained that a chancery court, if established, would be a State court and would not be limited by district court jurisdiction.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- John H. O. LaGatta, a resident of Reno, Nevada, expressed support for the concept of establishing a merged business and equity court. Mr. LaGatta pointed out that the Supreme Court of Delaware occasionally examines cases from the Court of Chancery, an equity court, regarding monetary issues and damages. He explained the Delaware Court of Chancery is renowned for handling nonmonetary issues such as injunctive relief and corporate governance, in particular. He was of the opinion that a separate chancery court is a good idea even if establishing the court takes time because the period of development can be used to advertise the court and attract major businesses and subsidiaries to incorporate in Nevada. In his view, business litigators would pay fees for efficiency and promptness in the disposition of cases. Mr. La Gatta indicated business court cases are generally more complex, so seating judges who understand the complexities would be very important.
- Senator Care referred to the 1999 Legislative Session and testimony given by Mr. LaGatta to the Senate Committee on Judiciary. He inquired as to what would be the: (1) jurisdiction of the courts; (2) location of the court; and (3) process for assigning judges to the court.
- Mr. LaGatta supported the appointment of judges and stated the Nevada Legislature would need to establish the framework for the operation of a chancery court.
- Assemblyman Carpenter stated that Mr. LaGatta has championed the business court concept for many years and encouraged him to attend other meetings of the Subcommittee.

DISCUSSION OF SCHEDULING AND WORK PLAN OF FUTURE MEETINGS

- Chairman Beers asked staff to gather information on the economic and legal impacts of chancery and business courts in other states, which was supported by the members. The next meeting for the Subcommittee was tentatively set for March 18, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Subcommittee, the meeting was adjourned at 10:48 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucinda Benjamin
Senior Research Secretary

Jennifer Chisel
Senior Research Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator Bob Beers, Chairman

Date: _____

LIST OF EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the “Meeting Notice and Agenda” provided by Jennifer Chisel, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

[Exhibit B](#) is a document titled “Report to the 71st Session of the Nevada Legislature by the Legislative Commission’s Subcommittee to Encourage Corporations and Other Business Entities to Organize and Conduct Business in this State,” provided by Jennifer Chisel, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB.

[Exhibit C](#) is the Eighth Judicial District Rule 1.61 “Assignment of business matters.” provided by Jennifer Chisel, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Second Judicial District Rule 2.1 “Business court docket.” provided by Jennifer Chisel, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB.

[Exhibit E](#) is a report titled “*Annual Report of the Nevada Judiciary Fiscal Year 2007*,” provided by Ron Titus, Court Administrator and Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court.

[Exhibit F](#) is a report titled “*Annual Report of the Nevada Judiciary Serving Nevada Fiscal Year 2006*,” provided by Ron Titus, Court Administrator and Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court.

[Exhibit G](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation titled “Judicial Branch Overview,” presented by A. William Maupin, Justice, Nevada Supreme Court.

[Exhibit H](#) is the written testimony of Brent T. Adams, District Court Judge, Department 6, Second Judicial District Court of Nevada, titled “Report to the Supreme Court of Nevada on the Business Court,” Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit I](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation titled “Business Court Eighth Judicial District Court,” presented by Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Court Judge, Department 11, Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada.

[Exhibit J](#) is the proposed revision of Rule 1.61 “Assignment of business matters.” offered by Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Court Judge, Department 11, Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada.

[Exhibit K](#) is a document titled “Electronic Filing and Service Order,” submitted by Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Court Judge, Department 11, Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada.

This set of “Summary Minutes and Action Report” is supplied as an informational service. Exhibits in electronic format may not be complete. Copies of the complete exhibits, other materials distributed at the meeting, and the audio record are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the Library online at www.leg.state.nv.us/lcb/research/library/feedbackmail.cfm or telephone: 775/684-6827.