

Scholarly Commons @ UNLV Boyd Law

Nevada Supreme Court Summaries

Law Journals

10-6-2011

Summary of G.C. Wallace, Inc. v. Dist. Ct., 126 Nev. Adv. Op. 64

Alan Miller

Nevada Law Journal

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.law.unlv.edu/nvscs>



Part of the [Property Law and Real Estate Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Miller, Alan, "Summary of G.C. Wallace, Inc. v. Dist. Ct., 126 Nev. Adv. Op. 64" (2011). *Nevada Supreme Court Summaries*. 224.

<https://scholars.law.unlv.edu/nvscs/224>

This Case Summary is brought to you by the Scholarly Commons @ UNLV Boyd Law, an institutional repository administered by the Wiener-Rogers Law Library at the William S. Boyd School of Law. For more information, please contact youngwoo.ban@unlv.edu.

PROPERTY – APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Summary

The Court examined a petition for a writ of mandamus challenging the district court's jurisdiction on grounds that a failure to raise the issue of damages in a summary eviction proceeding in justice court precluded a landlord from subsequently seeking damages in district court.

Disposition/Outcome

The Court denied the petitioner's writ of mandamus. Although all the elements of claim preclusion were met, the Court held the statute's legislative intent, determined by application of reason and public policy, created an exemption to claim preclusion for landlords seeking summary eviction.

Factual and Procedural History

Petitioner G.C. Wallace, Inc. (Wallace) defaulted on its monthly rent payments to Reef Centra Point B2348, Inc. (Reef Centra). After obtaining a summary eviction order in justice court, Reef Centra filed a subsequent complaint in district court for over \$50,000 in damages for Wallace's breach of the lease agreement. In Wallace's motion for summary judgment, Wallace asserted a damages action was barred by claim preclusion because Reef Centra did not raise the issue of damages together with the summary eviction, either in justice court or in district court. The district court denied summary judgment for Wallace. Wallace then petitioned for a writ of mandamus to direct the district court to vacate the order denying summary judgment.

Discussion

Chief Justice Saitta authored the opinion for the unanimous, three-justice panel. The Court began by examining the standards for writ relief. Generally, an appeal is considered an "adequate and speedy remedy" foreclosing the availability of writ relief.² However, the Supreme Court has discretion to consider writ relief challenging a denial of summary judgment if: (1) there is no factual dispute and summary judgment is required by statute or rule; or (2) there is an important issue of law requiring clarification and judicial economy favors granting writ relief.³ The Supreme Court determined that Wallace raised several important issues regarding summary eviction and that judicial economy warranted the Court's consideration of those issues because they were likely to recur.

Wallace claimed the district court's denial of summary judgment was an abuse of discretion because the doctrine of claim preclusion prevented Reef Centra from bringing a separate damages action in district court after obtaining a summary eviction in justice court under the same facts. The Court agreed the elements of claim preclusion were met, finding that: (1) the parties in both actions were identical; (2) the justice court's summary eviction was a valid final judgment; and (3) contrary to Reef Centra's assertions, the justice court's \$10,000 jurisdictional limitation did not prevent Reef

¹ By Alan Miller

² *Int'l Game Tech v. Dist. Ct.*, 124 Nev. 193, 197, 179 P.3d 556, 558 (2008).

³ *Id.* at 197-98, 179 P.3d at 558-59.

Contra from bringing its damages claim in justice court.

Although claim preclusion would normally prevent Reef Centra's subsequent damages action, an exception to claim preclusion applies when it appears "from a consideration of the entire statutory scheme that litigation, which on ordinary analysis might be considered objectionable as repetitive, is here intended to be permitted."⁴ The Court found the statutory language governing summary eviction⁵ was ambiguous because it reasonably allowed for conflicting interpretations as to whether a damages claim must be brought at the same time as a summary eviction proceeding. Furthermore, examination of the legislative history provided no conclusive indication of the Legislature's intent on the issue. Therefore, the Court determined the legislative intent by construing NRS 40.253 in accordance with reason and public policy.

Because NRS 40.253 provides a "swift and straightforward procedure for determining who is entitled to immediate possession," a requirement to litigate all claims arising from default would defeat the very purpose of the statute. Such a requirement would force landlords to either "forego the speedy resolution of possession in justice court or forfeit their claims for damages in excess of \$10,000." Furthermore, the litigation of all claims would place a heavy burden on the district court while underutilizing the justice court. Therefore, a statutory interpretation consistent with reason and public policy must allow a landlord to bring a summary eviction action in justice court without preventing the landlord's subsequent claim for damages, whether in justice court or district court. The order denying summary judgment for Wallace was not an abuse of the district court's discretion. Therefore, the Court upheld the denial of summary judgment.

Conclusion

The statutory scheme in NRS 40.253 indicates a legislative intent to permit an exception to the doctrine of claim preclusion in an action for summary eviction. A landlord, after seeking summary eviction in justice court, may properly bring a subsequent action for damages in either justice court or district court.

⁴ RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF JUDGMENTS § 26 cmt. e (1982).

⁵ NEV. REV. STAT. § 40.253 (2007).