1	DCRR	
	Attorney's Name	
2	Attorney's Bar Number	
3	Attorney's Firm Name Attorney's Address	
	Attorney's Phone Number	
4	Attorney's E-mail Address	
5	Party Attorney Represents	
6	EIGHTH JUDICIAL D	DISTRICT COURT
7	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
8	CEARCH COUNT	1,112,11211
	*,	CASE NO.
9	,	DEPT NO.
10	Plaintiff(s),	
10		
11	$ _{V}$.	Date of Hearing: *, 20
		Time of Hearing: a.m.
12	*, et al.,	<u> </u>
13		
	Defendant(s).	
14		
15		
	DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S REP	ORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
16	INCEDITIONS, SUDMETTING COUNCEL TO FIL	LOUTTHE INCODMATION DEGLICATED IN
17	INSTRUCTIONS: SUBMITTING COUNSEL TO FIL YELLOW BELOW. ALL OTHER MATTERS BELO	-
_ /	FILL OUT.	W MOST BE LEFT FOR THE COURT TO
18		
19	Party/Attorney for Plaintiff(s): [LIST]	
19		
20	Party/Attorney for Defendant(s): [LIST]	
21		
41		
22	On [HEARING DATE], the parties to the a	above-captioned matter appeared before the
		<u> </u>
23	Honorable Discovery Commissioner [Erin Trumar	Adam Ganz] by and through their counsel
24		
	listed above, on Movant's [INSERT FULL TITLE	OF MOTION] (the "Motion"). The Court
25	newigewood the Metion and HIGT ALL OTHER DID	EADINGSI and automained and analysis and
26	reviewed the Motion and LIST ALL OTHER PLI	EADINGS, and entertained oral argument
_	mode by the parties. For good cause appearing the Discovery Commissioner hereby maless the	
27	made by the parties. For good cause appearing, the Discovery Commissioner hereby makes the	
28	following findings and recommendations:	

I. <u>FINDINGS</u>

[INSERT FINDINGS REGARDING UNDERLYING MOTION]

A court may not award attorney fees or costs unless authorized to do so by a statute, rule, or contract. *U.S. Design & Const. Corp. v. Int'l Bhd. of Elec. Workers*, 118 Nev. 458, 462, 50 P.3d 170, 173 (2002). Movant seeks an award of reasonable attorney fees [AND COSTS].

A. MOVANT SEEKS AN AWARD OF ATTORNEY FEES

The Motion seeks an award of attorney fees pursuant to [INSERT STATUTE, RULE, OR CONTRACT]. [INSERT STATUTE, RULE, OR CONTRACT] allows for an award of fees where [LIST CIRCUMSTANCES APPLICABLE TO THE REQUEST].

The court here has determined that an award of attorney fees is appropriate, subject to proof, under [INSERT STATUTE, RULE, OR CONTRACT] because [INSERT REASONS].

Having determined that the Movant is entitled to an award of fees, the court next turns its attention to the amount of the award. The court required Movant to provide a Memorandum of Fees and Costs consistent with [INCLUDE ALL THAT APPLY] Brunzell v. Golden Gate Nat.

Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 455 P.2d 31 (1969); Beattie v. Thomas, 99 Nev. 579, 668 P.2d 268 (1983);

Wright v. Osburn, 114 Nev. 1367, 1370, 970 P.2d 1071, 1073 (1998). Movant's Memorandum of Fees and Costs was due on or before [DATE]. [NON-MOVING PARTY]'s response thereto was due [DATE]. The court made clear that untimely submissions would not be considered.

Movant filed [NAME OF SUPPLEMENTAL PLEADING] on [DATE]. Movant's [NAME OF SUPPLEMENTAL PLEADING] [was/was not] timely filed. [NON-MOVING PARTY] filed [NAME OF PLEADING] on [DATE] OR [[NON-MOVING PARTY] did file a response thereto. [NON-MOVING PARTY]'s [NAME OF PLEADING] [was/was not] timely filed.

The court has great discretion regarding its decision to award fees and regarding the amount of fees granted. The court's discretion is "tempered only by reason and fairness." *Albios v. Horizon Communities, Inc.*, 122 Nev. 409, 427, 132 P.3d 1022, 1034 (2006) (quoting *University of Nevada v. Tarkanian*, 110 Nev. 581, 591, 879 P.2d 1180, 1186 (1994)).

"In determining the amount of fees to award, the [district] court is not limited to one specific approach; its analysis may begin with any method rationally designed to calculate a reasonable amount, so long as the requested amount is reviewed in light of the" *Brunzell* factors. *Logan v. Abe*, 131 Nev. 260, 266, 350 P.3d 1139, 1143 (2015) (citing *Haley v. Eighth Judicial Dist. court*, 128 Nev. 171, 273 P.3d 855, 860 (2012) (internal quotations omitted)).

The Supreme court in *Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank*, 85 Nev. 345, 349–50, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969) gave guidance on how a court is to determine the reasonable value of the work performed by a movant's counsel. *Brunzell* directs courts to consider the following when determining a reasonable amount of attorney fees to award:

(1) the qualities of the advocate: his ability, his training, education, experience, professional standing and skill; (2) the character of the work to be done: its difficulty, its intricacy, its importance, time and skill required, the responsibility imposed and the prominence and character of the parties where they affect the importance of the litigation; (3) the work actually performed by the lawyer: the skill, time and attention given to the work; (4) the result: whether the attorney was successful and what benefits were derived.

Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). [IN FAMILY LAW CASES ADD THE FOLLOWING

LANGUAGE]: In addition to the *Brunzell* factors, the court must evaluate the disparity of income between parties to family law matters. *Wright v. Osburn*, 114 Nev. 1367, 1370, 970

¹ The court must determine the reasonable rates for all persons for whose time a party seeks reimbursement, including partners, associates, paralegals, and law clerks, etc. *See LVMPD v. Yeghiazarian*, 129 Nev. 760, 770, 312 P.3d 503, 510 (2013).

P.2d 1071, 1073 (1998).

The court can follow any rational method so long as it applies the *Brunzell* factors; it is not confined to authorizing an award of attorney fees exclusively from billing records or hourly statements. *Logan v. Abe*, 131 Nev. 260, 266, 350 P.3d 1139, 1143 (2015); *Shuette v. Beazer Homes Holdings Corp.*, 121 Nev. 837, 864, 124 P.3d 530, 549 (2005) (approving awards based on a "lodestar" amount, as well as a contingency fee arrangement). Although the court must "expressly analyze each factor", no single factor should be given undue weight. *Logan v. Abe*, 131 Nev. 260, 266, 350 P.3d 1139, 1143 (2015); *Brunzell*, 85 Nev. at 349-50, 455 P.2d at 33.

After determining the reasonable value of an attorney's services analyzing the factors established in *Brunzell*, the court must then provide sufficient reasoning and findings concerning those factors in its order. *Shuette v. Beazer Homes Holdings Corp.*, 121 Nev. 837, 865, 124 P.3d 530, 549 (2005). The court's decision must be supported by "substantial evidence". *Logan v. Abe*, 131 Nev. 260, 266, 350 P.3d 1139, 1143 (2015).

Substantial evidence supporting a request for fees must be presented to the court by "affidavits, unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury, depositions, answers to interrogatories, [or] admissions on file". EDCR 2.21(a). Sworn statements submitted pursuant to EDCR 2.21(a) must be sufficient to satisfy NRCP 56(e). EDCR 2.21(c). Unsworn statements of counsel and conclusory statements in pleadings not otherwise presented in compliance with EDCR 2.21(a) may not be considered by the court. The Supreme Court has confirmed that the *Brunzell* factors must be presented by affidavit or other competent evidence. *Miller v. Wilfong*, 121 Nev. 619, 624, 119 P.3d 727, 730 (2005); *Katz v. Incline Vill. Gen. Improvement Dist.*, 452 P.3d 411 (Nev. 2019), *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct. 253, 208 L. Ed. 2d 26 (2020) (citing *Herbst v. Humana Health Ins. of Nev., Inc.*, 105 Nev. 586, 591, 781 P.2d 762,

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
	u	

26

27

28

765 (1989) (holding that an affidavit documenting the hours of work performed, the length of litigation, and the number of volumes of appendices on appeal was sufficient evidence to enable the court to make a reasonable determination of attorney fees, even in the absence of a detailed billing statement); *Cooke v. Gove*, 61 Nev. 55, 57, 114 P.2d 87, 88 (1941) (upholding an award of attorney fees based on, among other evidence, two depositions from attorneys testifying about the value of the services rendered)). An award that is not based on such substantial evidence is subject to reversal, as the court will have no factual basis on which to base its decision. *Beattie v. Thomas*, 99 Nev. 579, 668 P.2d 268 (1983).

In the instant matter, Movant provided the court with the following sworn testimony and other evidence: [LIST SWORN STATEMENT(S) AND ALL OTHER EVIDENCE RELIED UPON]. Movant <u>argues</u> each *Brunzell* factor as follows:

- 1. The Qualities of the Advocate
- 2. The Character of the Work
- 3. The Work Performed
- 4. The Result
- **5. Disparity in Income** (Only in family law matters)

In response, [NON-MOVING PARTY] argues [SUMMARIZE].

B. SUMMARY OF FEES SOUGHT

Movant provided evidence suggesting [NAME OF ADVOCATE] spent [NUMBER OF

² An award that is not based on such substantial evidence is subject to reversal, as the court will have no factual basis on which to base its decision. *Beattie v. Thomas*, 99 Nev. 579, 668 P.2d 268 (1983).

Without competent evidence to "determine whether a cost was reasonable and necessary, a district court may not award costs." *Cadle*, 131 Nev. at 121, 345 P.3d at 1054 (citing *Bobby Berosini*, *Ltd.*, 114 Nev. at 1353, 971 P.2d at 386).

"[R]easonable costs' must be actual and reasonable, 'rather than a reasonable estimate or calculation of such costs.'" *Bobby Berosini, Ltd. v. PETA*, 114 Nev. 1348, 1352, 971 P.2d 383, 385 (1998). Movant must "demonstrate how such [claimed costs] were necessary to and incurred in the present action." *Id.*, 114 Nev. at 1352-53, 971 P.2d at 386. Conclusory arguments, or even statements in sworn testimony, that the costs were "reasonable and necessary" do not suffice. An award of costs based on such a conclusory statement is subject to reversal, as the court will lack "evidence on which to judge the reasonableness or necessity of each [cost]". *Cadle*, 131 Nev. at 121, 345 P.3d at 1054-55. Rather than merely *telling* the court the costs were reasonable and necessary, counsel's affidavit must attach "justifying documentation" verifying the costs were incurred and must *demonstrate* how those costs were both reasonable and necessary to the matter at issue. *Id.* (citing *Bobby Berosini, Ltd.*, 114 Nev. at 1352-53, 971 P.2d at 386). Without "justifying documentation" *and* counsel's explanation, there is "no way [for the court to] determined whether the cost was reasonable or necessary." *Id.*, 131 Nev. at 121-22, 345 P.3d at 1055.

The court has reviewed [LIST SWORN STATEMENT(S) AND ALL OTHER

EVIDENCE RELIED UPON IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR COSTS]. Movant argues

[SUMMARIZE]. In response, [NON-MOVING PARTY] argues [SUMMARIZE].

The court finds:

_____ Movant has adequately demonstrated through sworn testimony and "justifying documents" how the claimed costs were actually incurred, and were "reasonable and necessary"

1	to the action.		
2	Movant has not adequately <i>demonstrated</i> through sworn testimony and		
3	"justifying documents" how the claimed costs were actually incurred, and/or were "reasonable		
4 5	and necessary" to the action. Conclusory statements do not suffice. Accordingly, an award of		
6	costs is DENIED.		
7	Movant has not provided the court with receipts or other "justifying documents"		
8	introduced by competent testimony; thus, there is "no way [for the court to] determined whether		
9	the cost was reasonable or necessary." <i>Cadle</i> , 131 Nev. at 121-22, 345 P.3d at 1055.		
10	Movant failed to file a timely Memorandum of Costs and Fees, precluding an		
12	order granting the same.		
13	II. RECOMMENDATIONS		
14	IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED [INSERT RECOMMENDATIONS		
15	REGARDING THE UNDERLYING MOTION		
16 17	IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED, consistent with the findings herein,		
18	an award of attorney fees is GRANTED against the amount of		
19	s		
20	an award of attorney fees is DENIED.		
21	[ONLY INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE IF COSTS ARE BEING SOUGHT]		
22			
23 24	IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED, consistent with the findings herein,		
25	an award of costs is the amount of \$ is GRANTED.		
26	an award of costs is DENIED.		
27	IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED the award must be paid within days of entry		
28	of an order affirming and adopting these Recommendations.		

1	The Discovery Commissioner, having met with counsel for the parties, discussed the		
2	issues noted above, and having reviewed any materials proposed in support thereof, hereby		
3	submits the above recommendations.		
4 5	DATED this day of	, 20	
6			
7			
8		THE HONORABLE (ERIN TRUMAN/ADAM GANZ) DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER	
9		[CASE NAME AND CASE NUMBER]	
11	Submitted by:		
12	Attorney's Name		
13	Attorney's Firm Name Attorney's Address		
14	Attorney's E-mail Address Counsel for		
15			
16	Approved as to form and content by:		
17	Attorney's Name		
18	Attorney's Firm Name Attorney's Address		
19 20	Attorney's E-mail Address Counsel for		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1	NOTICE			
2	Pursuant to NRCP 16.3(c)(2), you are hereby notified that within fourteen (14) days after being			
3	served with a report any party may file and serve written objections to the recommendations. Written authorities may be filed with objections, but are not mandatory. If written authorities are filed, any other party may file and serve responding authorities within seven (7) days after			
4				
5	being served with objections.			
6	Objection time will expire on20			
7	Objection time win expire on2o			
8	A copy of the foregoing Discovery Commissioner's Report was:			
9	Mailed by United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, on, 20			
10 11	to the parties listed below at their last known address(es):			
12				
13				
14	Electronically e-filed and e-served to all registered counsel and parties on			
15	, 20, Pursuant to N.E.F.C.R. Rule 9.			
16				
17				
18	By:COMMISSIONER DESIGNEE			
19	COMMISSIONER DESIGNEE			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

1 2	ORDCR Attorney's Name	
3	Attorney's Bar Number Attorney's Firm Name	
4	Attorney's Address Attorney's Phone Number	
5	Attorney's E-mail Address Party Attorney Represents	
6	EIGHTH JUDICIAL D	ISTRICT COURT
7	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
8		
9	*,	
10	Plaintiff(s),	
11	v.	CASE NO.
12	* at al	DEPT NO.
13	*, et al.,	
14	Defendant(s).	HEARING DATE: HEARING TIME: 9:00 a.m.
15		HEARING TIME: 9:00 a.m.
16		
17	ORDE	
18	RE: DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S RE	EPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
19	The court, having reviewed the above report and re	ecommendations prepared by the Discovery
20	Commissioner and,	recommendations propuled by the 2 is covery
21	No timely objection having been filed,	
22		
23	After reviewing the objections to the Report and Recommendations and good cause	
24	appearing,	
25	* * *	
26		
27		
28		

CASE NAME: CASE NO: **AND** ____ IT IS HEREBY ORDERED the Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendations are affirmed and adopted. ____ IT IS HEREBY ORDERED the Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendations are affirmed and adopted as modified in the following manner. (attached hereto) _ IT IS HEREBY ORDERED this matter is remanded to the Discovery Commissioner for reconsideration or further action. _____ IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a hearing on the Discovery Commissioner's Report is set for ______, 20__, at ____:___ a.m.