

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

Date and Time of Meeting: Friday, January 16, 2026, at 2:00 p.m.

Place of Meeting: Hybrid - Zoom (zoom.com or zoom app, see “Notices” for access information)

In Person:

<i>Carson City</i>	<i>Las Vegas</i>
Supreme Court of Nevada 201 S. Carson Street <i>Bluebird Conference Room</i> Located in the Law Library	Supreme Court of Nevada 408 E. Clark Avenue Courtroom

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
 - A. Call of Roll
 - B. Determination of Quorum
 - C. Opening Remarks
- II. Public Comment
- III. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary*
 - A. November 18, 2025 (*Tab 1, page 3*)
- IV. Presentation Led by Professor Edwards from Boyd School of Law
 - A. An outline of the presentation will follow (*Tab 2, page 7*)
- V. Future Meetings
- VI. Public Comment
- VII. Adjournment

Notices

- Action items are noted by * and typically include, approval, denial, and/or postponement of specific items. Certain items may be referred to a subcommittee for additional review and action.
- Agenda items may be taken out of order at the discretion of the Chair in order to accommodate persons appearing before the Commission and/or to aid in the time efficiency of the meeting.
- If members of the public participate in the meeting, they must identify themselves when requested. Public comment is welcomed by the Commission but may be limited at the discretion of the Chair.
- If members of the public wish to attend the meeting in person, the Commission is pleased to provide reasonable accommodations. Individuals requiring accommodations or planning to attend in person are asked to notify Commission staff by phone or by email no later than two working days prior to the meeting, as follows: Almeda Harper, (775) 687-9810 – email: BusinessCourtCommission@nvcourts.nv.gov
- This meeting is exempt from the Nevada Open Meeting Law (NRS 241.030)
- At the discretion of the Chair, topics related to the administration of justice, judicial personnel, and judicial matters that are of a confidential nature may be closed to the public.
- **Notice of this meeting was posted in the following locations:** Nevada Supreme Court website: www.nvcourts.gov; Carson City: Supreme Court Building, Administrative Office of the Courts, 201 South Carson Street; Las Vegas: Nevada Supreme Court, 408 East Clark Avenue.

Zoom Meeting Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81634437321?pwd=4F6cbHMfz1WOOiIKYuP4vx88M8xaW4.1>
Teleconference Dial-in: 669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 816 3443 7321
Participant Passcode: 440080

TAB 1

Return to Agenda

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)
Justice Lidia Stiglich (Co-chair)
Francisco Aguilar
Michael Feder
Mark Ferrario
Judge Maria Gall
Judge Tom Gregory

Peter Guzman
Adam Hosmer-Henner
Chief Judge Lynne Jones
Robert Kim
Mary Newman
Tammy Peterson
Ann Silver

Chris Stanko
David Stanton
Erika Turner
Chief Judge Jerry Weise
Colby Williams
Steve Yeager

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

- Justice Bell, as chair, called the meeting to order at 12:07 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.

TAB 2

Return to Agenda

Agenda
Nevada Supreme Court
Commission to Study the Adjudication of Business Law Cases
Friday, January 16, 2026
2:00 p.m. PST

Presentations

1. Benjamin P. Edwards
Associate Dean for Faculty Development & Research
William S. Boyd School of Law

Subjects: Introduction; Overview; Reincorporation & Incorporation Trends

2. Anthony Rickey
Founder
Margrave Law

Subjects: The Delaware Court System's Strength; Trial Court Precedent

3. Eric Talley & Dorothy S. Lund
Marc and Eva Stern Professor of Law and Business
Columbia 1982 Alumna Professor of Law
Columbia Law School

Subjects: The Differentiated Product Framework for Corporate Law

4. Megan Wischmeier Shaner
Kenneth E. McAfee Chair in Law, President's Associates Presidential Professor
University of Oklahoma, College of Law

Subjects: An Overview of Business Courts Nationally; Oklahoma's Experience

5. Jessica M. Erickson
George E. Allen Chair in Law
University of Richmond School of Law

Subjects: Data Collection and Court Systems

6. Christopher J. Babcock (tentative)

Partner

Foley & Lardner LLP

Subjects: Texas Business Courts; The Texas Business Recruitment Strategy

7. Jai Ramaswamy

Chief Legal and Policy Officer

A16z Capital Management, L.L.C.

Subjects: Investing in Nevada; Courts and the Venture Capital Ecosystem

8. David J. Berger

Partner

Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, LLP

Subjects: Advising Public Companies on Jurisdictional Choice; Key Court System Considerations