1	РТОВ	
2	[NAME]	
3	[ADDRESS]	
	[ADDRESS]	
4	[PHONE]	
5	[E-MAIL]	
6	Petitioner, In Proper Person	
7		
8	DISTRICT CO	OURT
9	CLARK COUNTY,	NEVADA
10		
11		Case No.:
12	Petitioner,	Dept. No.:
13	VS.	
14	EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION, STATE OF NEVADA and LYNDA PARVEN in her	
15	capacity as Administrator of the EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION; J. THOMAS SUSICH, in	
16	his capacity as Chairperson of the EMPLOYMENT	
17	SECURITY DIVISION BOARD OF REVIEW, and	
18	as employer,	
	Respondents.	
19		
20	PETITIONER'S OPENING BR PETITION FOR JUDIC	
21		
22	COMES NOW, Petitioner,	
23	person, and submits the following Opening Brief in S	upport of her/his Petition for Judicial
	Review.	
24		© Civil Law Self-Help Center (Rev. 10/26/21)

1		DATED this day of	, 20	
2		Res	spectfully submitted,	
3		Dv		
4		By:	[SIGNATURE]	
5			[NAME]	
6			[ADDRESS]	
			[PHONE]	
7			[E-MAIL]	
8			Petitioner, In Proper Person	
9				
10		TABLE OF	CONTENTS	
11			<u></u>	Page
12	I.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE		<u> Luge</u>
13	1.			
14				
15		B. Course Of Proceedings		
		C. Statement Of Facts		
16	II.	STANDARD OF REVIEW		
17	III.	ARGUMENT		
18		A. The Appeals Referee's Decision V	Was Not Support by Substantial	
19		Evidence Because		
20		B. The Appeals Referee's Decision O	Tearly Erroneous as a Matter of	
21		1 1		
22				
23	III.	CONCLUSION		
24			© Civil Law Self-Help (Rev. 1	o Center 0/26/21)

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

2	A. <u>Nature of the Case</u>
3	Pursuant to NRS 612.530, this is a Petition for Judicial Review of Respondent Nevada
4	Employment Security Division's (hereinafter "ESD") denial of unemployment benefits to
5	Petitioner (hereinafter "Petitioner").
6	B. <u>Course of Proceedings</u>
7	Petitioner was employed at from
8	until Petitioner filed for unemployment
9	benefits with ESD and on, was [AWARDED OR DENIED] benefits.
10	(Record, p)
11	[PETITIONER OR EMPLOYER] timely appealed this denial by letter dated
12	, a hearing was held
13	before the appeals referee on Petitioner's eligibility for benefits. (Record, p)
14	In a written decision dated, the appeals referee found Petitioner
15	[ELIGIBLE OR INELIGIBLE] for unemployment benefits pursuant to NRS 612
16	(Record, p)
17	[PETITIONER OR EMPLOYER] appealed the Referee's decision to the Board of
18	Review (hereinafter "Board").
19	On, the Board entered its decision [DECLINING REVIEW or
20	AFFIRMING or REVERSING] the decision of the appeals referee. (Record, p) On
21	, [PETITIONER or EMPLOYER] filed the instant Petition for Judicial
22	Review.
23	
24	

24

1	C. <u>Statement of Facts</u>
2	Petitioner was employed at from
	until At the time of Petitioner's separation, [SHE or HE]
	was employed as a (Record, p) Petitioner
	was terminated on, allegedly for
	(Record, p)
	The Notice of Determination from the claims representative [DENIES or GRANTS]
	Petitioner's claim for unemployment benefits because
	(Record, p)
	At the hearing, Petitioner testified that
	(Record, p)
	The referee determined that
	© Civil Law Self-Help Center

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	(Record, p)
10	II. STANDARD OF REIVEW
11	Pursuant to NRS 612.530(4), if the Board of Review's finding of facts is supported by
12	evidence and without fraud, the jurisdiction of the court is confined to questions of law. See also
13	Employment Security Dept. v. Verrati, 104 Nev. 302, 756 P.2d 1196 (1988).
14	The district court's function is to review the final administrative determination for
15	arbitrariness, capriciousness, or a lack of substantial evidence. Employment Security Dept. v.
16	Weber, 100 Nev. 121, 676 P.2d 1318 (1984). Substantial evidence is that "quantity and quality
17	of evidence which a reasonable person could accept as adequate to support a conclusion."
18	Employment Security Dept. v. Cline, 109 Nev. 74, 847 P.2d 736 (1993). Employment Security
19	Dept. v. Hilton Hotels, 102 Nev. 606, 608 n.1, 729 P.2d 497, 498 n.1 (1986) (citation omitted).
20	The court must review de novo all questions of law including an agency's interpretation
21	of a statute. SIIS v. United Exposition Services, 109 Nev. Adv. Op 5 (1993); Employment
22	Security Dept. v. Capri Resorts, 104 Nev. 527, 763 P.2d 50, 51 (1988); Jones vs. Rosner, 102
23	Nev. 215, 719 P. 2d 805, 806 (1986).
_	

III. ARGUMENT

	III. ARGUMENI
A.	The Appeals Referee's Decision Was Not Support by Substantial Evidence Because
	Evidence Because .
В.	The Appeals Referee's Decision Was Clearly Erroneous as a Matter of
	Law Because .

(Rev. 10/26/21)

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	<u>V. CONCLUSION</u>
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	© Civil Law Self-Help Center (Rev. 10/26/21)
	(Rev. 10/26/21)

DATED this	day of		, 20	
		Respo	ectfully submitted,	
		By:	[SIGNATURE]	
			[NAME]	
			[ADDRESS]	
			[ADDRESS]	
			[PHONE]	
			[E-MAIL]	
			Petitioner, In Proper Person	
			© Civil Law Se (I	f-He

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING I hereby certify that on this _____ day of _____, 20____, I served the foregoing Petitioner's Opening Brief In Support Of Petition For Judicial Review, upon the following person(s), by depositing a copy of same in a sealed envelope in the United States Mail, postage pre-paid, to the following: Troy C. Jordan, Esq. State of Nevada, Department of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation **Employment Security Division** 500 East Third Street Carson City, NV 89713 DATED this ______, 20_ Signature of Person Mailing Document (Printed Name)