

Supreme Court of Nevada  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS  
State Court Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK  
Assistant Court Administrator

**Commission to Study the Adjudication of Business Law Cases**

November 18, 2025

2:00 p.m.

*Summary prepared by: Almeda Harper*

**Members Present**

Chief Justice Douglas Herndon (Co-chair)	Peter Guzman	Chris Stanko
Justice Lidia Stiglich (Co-chair)	Adam Hosmer-Henner	David Stanton
Francisco Aguilar	Chief Judge Lynne Jones	Erika Turner
Michael Feder	Robert Kim	Chief Judge Jerry Weise
Mark Ferrario	Mary Newman	Colby Williams
Judge Maria Gall	Tammy Peterson	Steve Yeager
Judge Tom Gregory	Ann Silver	

**Guests Present**

Ellen Bardash  
Harrison Bohn  
Roberto Campos  
Benjamin Edwards  
Maddie Gugino  
K. Hintz  
Richard Perkins  
Jacqueline Vokoun  
Judge Bitia Yeager

**AOC Staff Present**

Roland Blais  
Almeda Harper  
Alicia Lord  
John McCormick  
Jason Rickman

I. Call to Order

- Chief Justice Herndon, as co-chair, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.
- Ms. Harper called roll; a quorum was present.
- Opening Remarks
  - Chief Justice Herndon thanked those in attendance for their time and service and offered the following remarks:
    - The agenda for the inaugural meeting was intentionally general to encourage open discussion regarding the Commission's direction, the desired final product, the formation of future subcommittees, potential additional participants, and the types of presentations members would like to see.
    - Commission membership was carefully considered to include interested parties from all areas of the state.

II. Public Comment (limited to two minutes)

- No public comment was offered.
- Written public comments may be submitted at any time via email. A commission-specific email will be created and posted to the Commission's webpage.

- III. The attendees were invited to participate in an open discussion.
- Judge Gall suggested reviewing judicial workload and offered to share data from a weighted caseload study conducted by the Eighth Judicial District, if available. The metrics were organized by activity type (e.g., pretrial, post-disposition, and trial) and may be helpful in comparing the time required for business court cases with other case types.
  - The attendees discussed the general structure of a proposed business court.
    - It would operate as a dedicated docket, similar to the current model. Establishing a separate business court system would require legislative enactment.
    - Local rules specific to the business court were identified as beneficial. SCR 254, included in the Commission's ADKT, was noted as a starting point based on existing local court rules.
      - Create categories within local rules to ensure the proper assignment of cases.
      - Local rules should create consistency in procedures and rulings.
      - Adding a provision to expedite recusal may be beneficial.
      - The Second Judicial District Court uses a mechanism allowing business cases to proceed as regular cases when parties are unable to afford the applicable fees.
      - Existing local court rules should be reviewed to ensure cohesion.
    - The structure should be designed to accommodate a larger number of cases if business court is successful.
  - The attendees discussed potential mechanisms for selecting judges to oversee business court cases.
    - Dedicated business court judges could travel to hear cases, providing flexibility.
    - Cases could be assigned to any dedicated business court judge, providing a mechanism to balance caseload among those judges.
    - Dedicating specific district court judges to hear business court cases may not be feasible, as it would increase workloads for remaining judges; additionally, some judicial districts have only one judge.
    - The use of pro tempore attorneys with subject-matter expertise, appointed by district judges, was suggested.
    - The possibility of developing a pipeline of qualified judges was discussed, which could support the assignment of dedicated business court judges within the next five to ten years.
  - Justice Stiglich noted that, compared to national benchmarks, Nevada's business court cases lack speed and emphasized that the business court should be flexible, efficient, responsive and accurate. She further noted that publishing dispositions would benefit business court judges and asked the attendees how best to achieve these goals.
    - Attendees noted that statutory revision may be necessary to allow for the publication of dispositions.
      - The Commission to Study the Adjudication of Water Law Cases compiled a database of related water law cases to be used as reference and posts final orders or judgements on their webpage. It was suggested that this approach may benefit business court cases.
    - The attendees discussed the potential elimination of peremptory challenges for business court cases, noting that such challenges often create procedural difficulties and significantly delay proceedings.
      - Peremptory challenges are valuable in ensuring appropriate case assignments.
      - Associated fees are beneficial and could provide an opportunity for expedited proceedings if parties agree to pay higher fees.
      - It was suggested that a dedicated law-and-motion day could be created for business court cases; however, attendees emphasized the importance of maintaining a balanced allocation of attention across all court cases.
    - The attendees noted that credibility is important and that judges assigned to business court cases should have appropriate credentials.
  - Mr. Stanton asked how cases would be assigned to the business court - by advance agreement of the parties or by district judge assignment.

- Chief Justice Herndon clarified that attorneys currently have the option to file in business court and that this is unlikely to change.
- The attendees discussed transferring venues.
  - Traveling judges must learn the local court's procedures, which may put them at a disadvantage. Transferring venues would eliminate this hurdle by allowing the local staff to process cases effectively.
  - Transferring venues requires the public to travel, creating potential hardship.
  - Some judges may be unwilling to travel.
  - A traveling judge utilizes the local court, resulting in temporary displacement for the local judge.
  - A traveling judge may be more cost effective than asking all parties to travel.
- Chief Justice Herndon informed the attendees that he and Justice Stiglich intend to form subcommittees based on five or six primary topics identified during the discussion.
- Chief Justice Herndon asked the attendees for suggestions regarding presentations that may benefit the Commission.
  - National comparisons examining how other states conduct business courts, paired with discussion through a forum or moderated debate.
  - Examples of different business court models.

#### IV. Future Meetings

- TBD

#### V. Public Comment

- Professor Benjamin Edwards - "I'm happy to help. If there are particular questions that members of the court or the commission have, if you get them to me, I can work with our library, and our law students and RAs to try to pull information together. I've got an entire personal library full of slide decks on this issue that I can draw from and there are a lot of other academics writing papers on this issue now that I can draw from as well, to get you whatever information I can to help you do this."

#### VI. Adjournment

- There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.