#### BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

In the Matter of

THE HONORABLE DAWN HAVILAND,
Goodsprings Township Justice Court,
County of Clark, State of Nevada,

Respondent.

STATE OF NEVADA

JUN 1 3 2017

NEVADA COMMISSICM CN JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE
CASE NO. 2016-078-P

CASE NO. 2016-078-P

# ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO TAKE VIDEO DEPOSITION OF JEFF WELLS

Currently before the Commission on Judicial Discipline ("Commission") is Respondent's Motion for Leave to Take a Video Deposition of Jeff Wells ("Motion"), filed by counsel to the Honorable Dawn Haviland, Goodsprings Township Justice Court for Clark County, Nevada ("Respondent") on June 6, 2017. On June 8, 2017, the Prosecuting Officer to the Commission ("Prosecuting Officer") filed her Notice of No Opposition to Respondent Taking the Video Deposition of Jeff Wells.

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Formal Statement of Charges consists of eleven counts. The pertinent counts relating to the Motion are Counts Seven and Eight. Count Seven alleges that Respondent, in her capacity as a Justice of the Peace for Goodsprings Justice Court ("Goodsprings Court") in Clark County, Nevada, failed to properly manage the court after Respondent precipitously removed the Goodsprings Court from the Rural Court Administration. Count Eight involves the changing of the previously issued commercial vehicle warrants from the vehicle owners back to the originally cited drivers.

On June 6, 2017, Respondent filed her Motion for Leave to Take Video Deposition of Jeff Wells. The Motion states that Mr. Wells, in his role as Assistant County Manager for Clark County, Nevada, has budgetary and managerial oversight of all the Justice Courts in Clark County, including the

Goodsprings Court, and therefore, has personal knowledge of the relevant evidence pertaining to charges in Counts Seven and Eight, regarding court administration and commercial vehicle warrants. The Motion states that Mr. Wells will testify regarding the separation of the Goodsprings Court from the Rural Court Administration, and subsequent administrative activity of the Goodsprings Court. Furthermore, Mr. Wells will also testify that Respondent wanted to dismiss all of the cases with the improper warrants regarding commercial vehicle citations but that court staff refused to provide her with a list of cases.

The Motion notes that Mr. Wells is unavailable for the hearing set for the week of August 7, 2017, due to a previously planned and paid for family vacation. Therefore, Respondent seeks leave to take a video deposition of Mr. Wells on June 21, 2017, and to be able to use same at the hearing. The Prosecuting Officer has no objections to the taking of the video deposition, or the date of the deposition. However, the Prosecuting Officer reserves the right to object to the admission at the hearing of parts or all of the video and transcript of the deposition.

#### COMMISSION PROCEDURAL RULES AND NEVADA RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

## NRS 1.462. Proceedings before Commission; applicable rules

1. Proceedings before the Commission are civil matters designed to preserve an independent and honorable judiciary.

2. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 1.425 to 1.4695, inclusive, or in the procedural rules adopted by the Commission, after a formal statement of charges has been filed, the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure apply.

NRS § 1.462

## Commission Procedural Rule 24. Rules of evidence and due process

The rules of evidence applicable to civil proceedings apply at the hearing, and the respondent shall be accorded due process of law.

## Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 32. Use of depositions in court proceedings

(a) Use of Depositions. At the trial or upon the hearing of a motion or an interlocutory proceeding, any part or all of a deposition, so far as admissible under the rules of evidence applied as though the witness were then present and testifying, may be used against any party who was present or represented at the taking of the deposition or who had reasonable notice thereof, in accordance with any of the following provisions:

(3) The deposition of a witness, whether or not a party, may be used by any party for any purpose if the court finds:

(A) that the witness is dead; or

(B) that the witness is at a greater distance than 100 miles from the place of trial or hearing, or is out of the State, unless it appears that the absence of the witness was procured by the party offering the deposition; or

(C) that the witness is unable to attend or testify because of age, illness, infirmity, or

imprisonment; or

(D) that the party offering the deposition has been unable to procure the attendance of the witness by subpoena; or

(E) upon application and notice, that such exceptional circumstances exist as to make it desirable, in the interest of justice and with due regard to the importance of presenting the testimony of witnesses orally in open court, to allow the deposition to be used.

(4) If only part of a deposition is offered in evidence by a party, an adverse party may require the offeror to introduce any other part which ought in fairness to be considered with the part introduced, and any party may introduce any other parts.

NRCP 32

#### DISCUSSION AND ORDER

The use of a deposition transcript at trial when a witness is unavailable is meant to be given the same weight as live testimony. See Nicklo v. Peter Pan Playskool, 97 Nev. 73, 624 P.2d 22 (1981). NRCP 32. NRCP 32 specifies the manner in which deposition testimony may be offered into evidence at the time of a hearing. With respect to non-party witnesses, NRCP 32(a)(3) allows the court to permit the use of a deposition at hearing, if a witness is not available to attend the hearing. Furthermore, NRCP 30(b)(4) notes that a deposition may be videotaped and presented at a hearing. Mr. Wells will be on a preplanned and prepaid vacation the week of the hearing, and Respondent described the relevancy of his testimony as it relates to the Formal Statement of Charges. The factual circumstances meet the requirements of NRCP 32(a)(3)(E), regarding the interests of justice, in order to permit the deposition to be used at the hearing, however the deposition is still subject to evidentiary objections by the Prosecuting Officer at the hearing and/or prior to the hearing regarding its admissibility.

Therefore, Respondent's Motion for Leave to Take Video Deposition of Jeff Wells is hereby granted in that the deposition may take place, and be used at Respondent's hearing, subject to the applicable Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure and Nevada Rules of Evidence.

The Honorable Thomas Armstrong is authorized to sign this order on behalf of the full Commission.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of June, 2017.

STATE OF NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

Thomas Armstrong, Presiding Judge

## 

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify on this day of June, 2017, I transmitted a copy of the foregoing ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO TAKE VIDEO DEPOSITION OF JEFF WELLS, via email and by placing said document in the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, addressed to:

Albert Marquis, Esq.
Marquis Aurbach Coffing Attorney at Law
10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89145
amarquis@maclaw.com

Kathleen Paustian, Esq.
Law Offices of Kathleen M. Paustian
3205 Skipworth Drive
Las Vegas,NV 89107
kathleenpaustian@cox.net

Janet Jacobsen, Commission Clerk