

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BARBARA STUART ROBINSON,
Appellant,
vs.
MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL,
Respondent.

No. 79421-COA

FILED

JUL 21 2020

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Barbara Stuart Robinson appeals from a district court summary judgment entered in a tort action. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Rob Bare, Judge.

Robinson was arrested and received a citation for a violation of a county ordinance because she left luggage on the sidewalk of Las Vegas Boulevard. She filed a complaint against respondent MGM Resorts International, which appears to be for defamation related to the arrest, because she asserted that MGM provided false information to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department that resulted in the arrest. Both Robinson and MGM moved for summary judgment and the district court denied Robinson's motion and granted MGM's.

In ruling on the motions, the district court found that Robinson's motion failed to set out a statement of undisputed facts, provide appropriate citations to evidence, or provide any actual evidence demonstrating that MGM took the actions alleged in her complaint. To the

contrary, the district court found that MGM provided evidence demonstrating that it was not involved with Robinson's arrest and that Robinson failed to rebut that evidence. Since Robinson could not produce evidence to establish her claims, the district court found that summary judgment in favor of MGM was appropriate. It further found that, under *Pope v. Motel 6*, 121 Nev. 307, 114 P.3d 277 (2005), even if MGM had made statements to the police, MGM would have enjoyed a qualified privilege for such statements and thus, summary judgment would still be proper because an unprivileged publication is a necessary element of a defamation claim.

On appeal, Robinson summarily states that she presented evidence that MGM had involvement with her arrest, but fails to develop any cogent argument as to how any such evidence would have changed the result. Instead, as she did in the district court, she sets forth conclusory allegations regarding MGM's purported conduct. Because she failed to provide cogent argument in this regard, we need not consider this issue. See *Edwards v. Emperor's Garden Rest.*, 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (declining to consider issues that are not supported by cogent argument).

Robinson further summarily asserts that the district court committed errors of fact and law, and that there were disputed factual issues, but again fails to develop any cogent argument on these points and we therefore decline to consider them. See *id.* Lastly, Robinson appears to assert that the district court erred in its determination that MGM enjoyed a qualified privilege for any purported statement to the police, but as with the other issues, she fails to develop cogent argument as to how this

determination was in error and we likewise decline to consider it. *See id.*
Based on the foregoing, we necessarily

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.¹


_____, C.J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Tao


_____, J.
Bulla

cc: Hon. Rob Bare, District Judge
Barbara Stuart Robinson
Pisanelli Bice, PLLC
Eighth District Court Clerk

¹To the extent Robinson raises issues that are not specifically addressed herein, we have reviewed the same and conclude they do not provide a basis for relief.