


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DAIMON MONROE,
Appellant,
vs.
LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE
DEPARTMENT,
Respondent.

No. 74846

FILED

JUN 15 2018

EMERSON A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE


This is a pro se appeal from a district court's post-judgment award of attorney fees and costs in a forfeiture proceeding. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Douglas Smith, Judge.¹


We conclude that the district court was within its discretion in awarding respondent LVMPD attorney fees and costs, as the district court's award is supported by its consideration of the factors set forth in *Beattie v. Thomas*, 99 Nev. 579, 588-89, 668 P.2d 268, 274 (1983) (listing relevant factors a district court must consider regarding the offer of judgment and reviewing a district court's award of fees and costs based on a rejected offer of judgment for an abuse of discretion), and *Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank*, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969) (listing relevant factors in determining whether the amount requested is reasonable). Although appellant contends that the district court erred in determining he lacked a good-faith defense to LVMPD's claims, it was repeatedly explained to appellant that the underlying forfeiture proceeding was not the appropriate forum to litigate his allegations regarding allegedly fraudulent


¹We conclude that a response to the informal brief is not necessary. NRAP 46A(c). Pursuant to NRAP 34(f)(3), this appeal has been decided based on the pro se brief and the record.

search warrants. *See, e.g., Monroe v. Las Vegas Metro. Police Dep't*, Docket No. 74388 (Order of Affirmance, April 12, 2018, at 2 n.2). Similarly, although appellant contends that the district court erred in determining that the amount of LVMPD's offer of judgment was reasonable in light of higher offers made to appellant's codefendants, the record reflects that LVMPD's offers to those codefendants were based on different factual circumstances. Because we are not persuaded that appellant's remaining arguments warrant reversal, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.


Gibbons, J.


Pickering, J.


Hardesty, J.

cc: Hon. Douglas Smith, District Judge
Daimon Monroe
Marquis Aurbach Coffing
Liesl K. Freedman
Matthew J. Christian
Eighth District Court Clerk