

1 ORDR

2  
3  
4 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA  
6

7  
8 STEVE EGGLESTON,  
9 Plaintiff,

Case No.: A-16-748919-C  
Dept. No.: XXII

10 vs.

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
ORDER ALLOWING CAMERA ACCESS  
TO COURT PROCEEDINGS**

11 GEORGINA STUART; CLARK COUNTY  
12 NEVADA; LISA CALLAHAN; BRIAN  
13 CALLAHAN; AND DOES I THROUGH 100,  
14 INCLUSIVE,  
15 DOES I-X,  
16 Defendants.

17 On February 17, 2022, this Court approved a request by Our Nevada Judges to have camera  
18 access and provide electronic coverage of these proceedings to the public. On February 23, 2022,  
19 Defendants filed a motion to reconsider. On same day, Our Nevada Judges, by and through its  
20 counsel, filed opposition. On April 11, 2022, Defendants filed reply to opposition. On May 10,  
21 2022, Parties convened before the Court for oral arguments.

22 Defendant argues for a total revocation of camera access, purporting it would be impossible  
23 to preserve confidentiality. Our Nevada Judges asserts it can comply with confidentiality  
24 directives, cites a history of protecting the privacy and identity of children, and recognizes a need  
25 to consider and protect the privacy and identity of children in this case.  
26  
27  
28

1 **I. SCR 230(2) Findings**

2 SCR 230(2) requires this Court to “make particularized findings on the record when  
3 determining whether electronic coverage will be allowed at a proceeding”. Specifically, this Court  
4 finds that “[t]he impact of coverage upon the right of any party to a fair trial” is unlikely; “[t]he  
5 impact of coverage upon the right of privacy of any party or witness” is acceptable with the media  
6 directives outlined further in this order; “[t]he impact of coverage upon the safety and well-being  
7 of any party, witness or juror” is acceptable with the media directives outlined further in this order;  
8 it is unlikely “that coverage would distract participants or would detract from the dignity of the  
9 proceedings”; “[t]he adequacy of the physical facilities of the court for coverage” is of no concern  
10 except potentially<sup>1</sup> during any *voir dire* of a jury venire; and, no “other factor [would appear to]  
11 affect[] the fair administration of justice.”  
12

13 **II. Conclusions of Law**

14 Consistent with this Court’s prior findings on SCR 230(2)(b) and SCR 230(2)(c), specific  
15 media directives are now set forth protecting the identity and privacy of children in this case. Our  
16 Nevada Judges as an organization, and Alexander Falconi as the administrator, owner, operator,  
17 and controller, is ordered to refrain from publishing or otherwise disclosing the following:  
18

- 19 1) confidential documentation and records presented during hearings in this case;  
20 2) information concerning the Indiana guardianship proceedings;  
21 3) the names and identities<sup>2</sup> of any children in this case; and  
22 4) any documents that are sealed.  
23

24 Our Nevada Judges can have access only to public<sup>3</sup> information.  
25

26 <sup>1</sup> This Court will consider any such impact if and when jury selection is scheduled to occur. SCR  
27 231(2).

28 <sup>2</sup> This prohibition includes the rendition and publication of any likenesses of any children in this  
case.

<sup>3</sup> This includes confidential information rendered public by virtue of redactions that appropriately  
conceal from the public specific portions that are confidential.

1 In order to better ensure these privacy directives are fully complied with, live streaming of  
2 the proceedings shall be also prohibited.

3 SCR 230(2) contemplates a presumption of electronic coverage, favoring Our Nevada  
4 Judges, who's purpose as an organization is to educate the public.

5 Defendants have failed to overcome the overriding public interest making essential the  
6 need to maintain the openness of these proceedings. The media directives outlined in this Order  
7 are narrowly tailored to ensure these proceedings remain as open as possible, while simultaneously  
8 protecting the minor children and their identities.

9  
10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant's *Motion to Reconsider and/or Revoke Order*  
11 *Granting Media Request Allowing Camera Access to Court Proceedings* filed May 10, 2022 is  
12 GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART.

13  
14 Dated this 9th day of June, 2022

15 

16 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

17 Submitted by: /s/ Luke Busby  
18 Luke Busby, Esq.  
19 *Counsel for Our Nevada Judges*

20 **CA8 E4D B2EE BF32**  
21 **Susan Johnson**  
22 **District Court Judge**

23 Approved as to form and content by:

24 *Did not respond*  
25 Felicia Galati, Esq.  
26 *Counsel for the Defendants*

27 *Did not respond*  
28 Nadia Ahmed, Esq.  
*Counsel for the Plaintiff*

1 **CSERV**

2  
3 DISTRICT COURT  
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5  
6 Steve Eggleston, Plaintiff(s)

CASE NO: A-16-748919-C

7 vs.

DEPT. NO. Department 22

8 Georgina Stuart, Defendant(s)

9  
10 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

11 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District  
12 Court. The foregoing Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system to all  
13 recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

14 Service Date: 6/9/2022

15 Felicia Galati

fgalati@ocgas.com

16 Steve Eggleston

theeggman411@gmail.com

17 Tanya Bain

tbain@clarkhill.com

18 Paola Armeni

parmeni@clarkhill.com

19 Steve Eggleston

steve@steveegglestonwrites.com

20 Theresa Mains

Theresa@TheresaMainsPA.com

21 Brittany Falconi

media@ournevadajudges.com

22 Nadia Ahmed

nahmed@clarkhill.com

23 Administration OurNevadaJudges

admin@ournevadajudges.com

24 Luke Busby

luke@lukeandrewbusbyltd.com

25 Ida Sedlock

isedlock@ocgas.com

26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28