

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
IN AND FOR CLARK COUNTY, STATE OF NEVADA**

JIM MARCHANT, as an individual, as a  
Nevada Fourth Congressional District  
Representative, and as a Voter in Clark  
County, Nevada,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH P. GLORIA, in his official capacity  
as Registrar of Voters for Clark County,  
Nevada; CLARK COUNTY, a political  
subdivision of the State of Nevada; DOES I  
through X; and ROE CORPORATIONS I  
through X, inclusive,

Defendants,

and

DNC SERVICES  
CORPORATION/DEMOCRATIC  
NATIONAL COMMITTEE and NEVADA  
STATE DEMOCRATIC PARTY,

Intervenor-  
Defendants.

Case No. A-20-824878-W  
Dept. No.: 26

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Jim Marchant's Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief (the "Petition"). The Court held a hearing to address Plaintiff's Petition on November 20, 2020. Counsel for all parties were present. The Court has considered all of the papers filed by the parties and proposed Intervenor-Defendants and the files and records in this matter and, after considering the parties' oral arguments, rules as follows.

The Court **GRANTS** the application of Kevin J. Hamilton to appear pro hac vice in this matter. Mr. Hamilton is a lawyer admitted to practice before the Bar of the State of Washington, has produced evidence of his good standing before that Bar, and has otherwise complied with Nevada Supreme Court Rule 42.

[PROPOSED] ORDER

1           The Court **GRANTS** the Motion to Intervene on behalf of the Nevada State Democratic  
2 Party and the DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee (“Intervenor-  
3 Defendants”). The Court heard oral arguments on Intervenor-Defendants’ Motion to Intervene  
4 from Intervenor-Defendants and Plaintiff. Defendants did not oppose intervention. The Court finds  
5 that permissive intervention under Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b) is warranted. Intervenor-  
6 Defendants’ motion was timely, having been filed just two days after the Petition and before any  
7 substantive hearings were held in this case. Intervenor-Defendants, which represent the  
8 Democratic Party at the state and national level, are appropriate parties to represent the interests of  
9 Representative Horsford and have defenses that share with the main action common questions of  
10 law or fact. Their intervention is therefore appropriate.

11           The Court **DENIES** the Petition and **DISMISSES** this case. In this action, Plaintiff seeks  
12 a writ of mandamus or injunctive relief requiring a new election for Nevada’s Fourth  
13 Congressional District in Clark County. The Court will not order such relief for the following  
14 reasons.

15           First, the Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the case. Plaintiff’s complaint, although  
16 characterized as a petition for mandamus and complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief,  
17 plainly is an attempt to state a claim for an election contest under NRS 293.407. The extraordinary  
18 relief Plaintiff seeks here—the ordering of a “new election” (or “revote”) for Nevada’s Fourth  
19 Congressional District in Clark County—is available only through an election contest under NRS  
20 293.407, which, if successful, empowers a court to “annul[] or set aside” an election, NRS  
21 293.417. Nevada’s election contest statute, however, explicitly excludes federal legislative  
22 elections from its scope. NRS 293.407 (“A candidate at any election . . . may contest the election  
23 of any candidate, *except for the office of United States Senator or Representative of Congress.*”) (emphasis added). The statute reflects the Nevada Legislature’s considered decision to carve out  
24 election contests over federal legislative elections, and thus this Court cannot entertain this action  
25 regardless of how it is characterized. Given the clarity of the statutory language, a disappointed  
26 federal candidate cannot plead around the explicit statutory exclusion contained in NRS 293.407  
27 by characterizing his or her petition as one merely seeking a writ of mandamus. As a result, this  
28

1 Court lacks jurisdiction to proceed, the Petition must be denied, and the action dismissed.

2 Second, even if the Court had jurisdiction to entertain the Petition, the matter fails on the  
3 merits. A writ of mandamus is available “to compel the performance of an act which the law  
4 especially enjoins as a duty resulting from an office, trust or station.” NRS 34.160. Plaintiff seeks  
5 a writ of mandamus compelling the Board of County Commissioners to “order a new election as  
6 mandated under NRS 293.495.” But the statute invoked by Plaintiff is not applicable in this  
7 context. The statute states:

8 If an election is prevented in any precinct or district by reason of the *loss or*  
9 *destruction of the ballots* intended for that precinct, or any other cause, the  
10 appropriate election officers in that precinct or district shall make an affidavit  
11 setting forth that fact and transmit it to the appropriate board of county  
12 commissioners. Upon receipt of the affidavit and upon the application of any  
candidate for any office to be voted for by the registered voters of that precinct or  
district, the board of county commissioners shall order a new election in that  
precinct or district.

13 NRS 293.465 (emphasis added). Here, no ballots have been “lost and destroyed” within the  
14 meaning of NRS 293.465. *See LaPorta v. Broadbent*, 91 Nev. 27 (1975) (applying NRS 293.465  
15 where “ballots were absent” for the precinct in question on election day “[f]or a period of  
16 approximately three hours” for two of the candidates for office). NRS 293.465 is therefore  
17 inapplicable to the facts pled in the Petition and unavailable as a means to seek relief here.

18 Third, this Court finds that even if it had jurisdiction to hear this case, which it does not,  
19 the Court would be unable to fashion the remedy sought in the Petition. Plaintiff seeks a new  
20 election in Clark County alone, just one of seven counties that comprise the congressional district  
21 for which he sought office. Plaintiff’s margin of defeat in Clark County is more than 33,000 votes,  
22 which the Court finds to be an insurmountable deficit to overcome on the facts before it. Based on  
23 the record placed before the Court in the Petition, Plaintiff can “prove no set of facts, which, if  
24 true, would entitle [him] to the relief” he seeks. *Buzz Stew, LLC v. City of N. Las Vegas*, 124 Nev.  
25 224, 228, 181 P.3d 670, 672 (2008).

26  
27  
28

1           **NOW THEREFORE**, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice filed by  
2 Kevin J. Hamilton, Esq.; **GRANTS** Intervenor Defendants' Motion to Intervene; **DENIES**  
3 Plaintiff's Petition; and **DISMISSES** this case.

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of November, 2020.

Dated this 23rd day of November, 2020

  
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

03A D84 4140 C30C  
Gloria Sturman  
District Court Judge

Submitted by:

Intervenor-Defendants  
Nevada State Democratic Party and the DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee

By: /s/ Bradley Schrager

Bradley S. Schrager, Esq., SBN 10217  
Daniel Bravo, Esq., SBN 13078  
3556 E. Russell Road, Second Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89120

Kevin J. Hamilton, Esq. Wash. Bar No. 15648\*  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
Seattle, WA 98101

*\*Appearing pro hac vice*

1 CSERV

2 DISTRICT COURT  
3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4  
5  
6 Jim Marchant, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-20-824884-W

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 26

8 Joseph Gloria, Defendant(s)

9  
10 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

11 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District  
12 Court. The foregoing Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system to all  
13 recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

14 Service Date: 11/23/2020

15 Bradley Schrager	bschrager@wrslawyers.com
16 Dannielle Fresquez	dfresquez@wrslawyers.com
17 Daniel Bravo	dbravo@wrslawyers.com
18 Craig Mueller	craig@craigmuellerlaw.com
19 Craig Mueller	electronicservice@craigmuellerlaw.com
20 Susie Ward	susie@craigmuellerlaw.com
21 Catherine Ramsey	cathy@craigmuellerlaw.com

22  
23 If indicated below, a copy of the above mentioned filings were also served by mail  
24 via United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, to the parties listed below at their last  
25 known addresses on 11/24/2020

26 Bradley Schrager	Wolf, Rifkin, Shapiro, Schulman & Rabkin, LLP
	3556 E. Russell Rd.
27	Las Vegas, NV, 89120

28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Steven Wolfson

Clark County District Attorney  
200 Lewis Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Las Vegas, NV, 89155

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM