



OBJ

Jason Naimi, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9441
Neil M. Mullins, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 3544
Ilan Acherman, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 12320
NAIMI MULLINS LAW GROUP
efile@naimilaw.com
10000 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 160
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
Telephone: 702.901.4800
Attorneys for Petitioner, *Mitchell and Danielle Britten*

**DISTRICT COURT, FAMILY DIVISION
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

In the Matter of the Guardianship of:

PALMER PRINCE,

A Proposed Protected Minor

CASE NO: G-24-060266-M
DEPT. NO.: U

**OBJECTION TO BROADCAST, RECORD, AND PHOTOGRAPH OR
TELEVISION THE HEARING**

Appearance via Simultaneous Audiovisual Transmission Equipment

COMES NOW, Petitioners, MITCHELL BRITTEN and DANIELLE BRITTEN, by and through their respective counsel, JASON NAIMI, ESQ., and ILAN ACHERMAN, ESQ., of NAIMI MULLINS LAW GROUP, and hereby submits their Objection to Broadcast, Record, and Photograph or Televises the Hearing.

Petitioners respectfully move this Court to enter the following:

1. An Order disallowing Alex Falconi and Our Nevada Judges' request to Broadcast, Record, Photograph or Televises the Hearing; and
2. For such other relief deemed just and equitable by the court under the circumstances.

//
//
//
//

NAIMI MULLINS LAW GROUP
10000 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 160, Las Vegas, NV 89135
Telephone: 702.901.4800

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

This Objection is made and based upon the attached Points and Authorities, as well as any exhibits and affidavits attached hereto, all papers and pleadings on file herein, and any oral argument adduced at the hearing of this matter.

DATED this 19th day of July 2024

NAIMI MULLINS LAW GROUP

/s/Ilan Acherman
Jason Naimi, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9441
Neil M. Mullins, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 3544
Ilan Acherman, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 12320
NAIMI MULLINS LAW GROUP
efile@naimilaw.com
10000 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 160
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
Telephone: 702.901.4800
Attorneys for Petitioner, *Mitchelle and Danielle Britten*

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ALLEGATIONS**

3 At issue in this case is the guardianship of Palmer Prince (“Palmer”), a seven
4 (7) month old baby girl, whose parents were tragically murdered on April 8, 2024.
5 The murder followed years of heightened conflict between Palmer’s mother, Ashley
6 Prince, and her ex-husband, Dylan Houston, as they were engaged in a highly
7 contested custody matter involving Palmer’s half-siblings. Palmer is an innocent
8 victim in all of this, and Mr. Falconi would make a spectacle of the necessary
9 proceedings involving Palmer’s brother, her grandparents, and the initial Petitioners
10 to this case, Mitchell and Danielle Britten, who just want to make sure Palmer is well
11 cared for.

12 This case will necessarily involve disputes between members of Palmer’s
13 family and those who just want the best for her. Those disputes will inevitably lead to
14 testimony and argument, and will likely include emotional, and at times perhaps less
15 than flattering, moments involving Palmer’s family.

16 No one has sought to completely seal this matter. The public, including the press
17 and Mr. Falconi’s Our Nevada Judges, will have access to all pertinent information
18 regarding these proceedings. That will include access to filings, decisions, court
19 orders, and even transcripts of proceedings if they so choose. What would be
20 detrimental to Palmer, however, is having the faces of her potential guardians
21 plastered all over the internet, possibly placing Palmer’s guardians, and Palmer
22 herself, at risk.

23 Just as detrimental to Palmer’s best interests would be the very real likelihood
24 of her guardians, her family, her brother and grandparents, possibly fighting in a
25 courtroom, all on the internet, forever. How tragic for Palmer, having lost her parents,
26 to later – five, six, ten years on – have her school friends showing her videos on
27 YouTube of her grandparents possibly talking badly about her brother or her
28

1 guardians, all in color and streamed for the world to see. Petitioners ask that the Court
2 protect Palmer from that reality.

3 **II. Legal Analysis**

4 **A. There are extraordinary Circumstances in this case overcoming the Press’**
5 **Interest.**

6 There exist competing interests between litigants’ privacy rights in family law
7 proceedings and the press’ and the public’s interest to access court proceedings.
8 *Falconi, v. Eight Judicial District Court*, 140 Nev., Advanced Opinion 8 (2024). The
9 public’s right to access to those proceedings can be precluded where the Court finds
10 extraordinary circumstances warranting such preclusion.

11
12 “In any other proceedings in Nevada, before a district court can close those
13 proceedings “(1) the party seeking to close the hearing must advance an
14 overriding interest that is likely to be prejudiced; (2) the closure must be no
15 broader than necessary to protect the overriding interest; (3) the trial court must
16 consider reasonable alternatives to closing the proceedings; and (4) the trial
17 court must make findings adequate to support the closure.”

18 *Feazell v. State*, 11 Nev. 1446, 1449, 906 P.2d 727, 729 (1995); *Falconi, v. Eight*
19 *Judicial District Court*, 140 Nev., Advanced Opinion 8 (2024). As the *Falconi* Court
20 pointed out, the value of openness lies in ensuring confidence in the public that
21 standards of fairness are being observed. *Id.* at 97. Any deviation from complete
22 openness should ensure that those interests are addressed.

23 In this present case, Palmer’s safety and her future emotional and psychological
24 well-being rely on the Court providing some minimal protections. In this case,
25 Palmer’s privacy and safety interests can be protected, while ensuring that the public’s
26 interest the openness of proceedings are also preserved.

26 ///
27 ///
28 ///

1 **1. The party seeking to close the hearing must advance an overriding interest**
2 **that is likely to be prejudiced.**

3 Palmer’s safety and well-being is an overriding interest in this case. Palmer did
4 not choose to be the subject of these proceedings, she has been thrust into this by the
5 tragic death of her parents. Mr. Falconi asks that he be able to broadcast her family’s
6 dispute on the internet, subjecting Palmer to those images now and into the future.

7 Importantly, there is a safety concern in this case, both for Palmer and for the
8 Brittens. Many of those fears have already been articulately explained by Palmer’s
9 grandparents and include the fear of additional violence as Paul and Julie Page
10 continue the custody dispute with Dylan Houston. The Brittens fear being brought into
11 that conflict, and they have done everything they can to separate themselves and
12 Palmer from the possibility of that conflict affecting their lives. Having their faces
13 plastered in the media will add nothing to advance the public’s interest in ensuring the
14 access to these proceedings. The same information regarding these proceedings can
15 be readily gleaned from transcripts, filings, and the Court Record, without subjecting
16 Palmer and her caretakers to public harassment or the safety concerns that being
17 publicly recognizable will surely bring.

18 There is also a concern about Palmer’s emotional and psychological well-being
19 well into the future. These videos, posted on the internet, will be there forever. When
20 Palmer is six, ten, sixteen years old, she or her friends will have easy and ready access
21 to these videos where her family’s disputes have been broadcast. A simple search for
22 the “Prince” name will present Palmer with those videos, which will show her own
23 grandparents’ testimony, subjecting Palmer to the possibility of further harassment
24 and possible ridicule. Palmer has already lost her parents; we should not add to that
25 by turning these proceedings into a spectacle that will haunt Palmer into the future.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **2. The closure must be no broader than necessary to protect the overriding**
2 **interest.**

3 Petitioners ask only that the parties’ contact information and video of these
4 proceedings be maintained private. The public will have access to all other
5 information, including filings, briefs, court orders, and even transcripts of
6 proceedings. All information necessary for the public to ensure that “standards of
7 fairness are being observed” and that “procedures are being followed and that
8 deviations will become known,” will be available without the need for video
9 recordings to be plastered all over the internet.

10 **3. The trial court must consider reasonable alternatives to closing the**
11 **proceedings.**

12 There is no objection that the documents in this case be made publicly available.
13 The objection is to prevent further exploitation of this family’s tragedy in even greater
14 detail by the media’s salacious intent to capture sensationalizing headlines and
15 images. Those involved in this tragedy need not have their most private and vulnerable
16 moments on public display. The documents would be available, allowing the public
17 to be kept abreast of the guardianship of baby Palmer. The accessibility will allow an
18 alternative means of information to be obtained, while still allowing the lives of those
19 involved to remain private. The public has speculated on the deaths of Palmer’s
20 parents, the circumstances that led to it, how it could have been avoided, and whether
21 similar situations could be avoided in the future. Palmer is already growing up within
22 this paradigm. It would be beneficial to her now, and as she gets older, to have her
23 story contained as much as possible without depriving the public of information.
24 Therefore, the Court should deny the right of these proceedings to become public.

25 **4. The trial court must make findings adequate to support the closure.**

26 All documents will be available in this case, (including this one), and therefore,
27 the Court’s findings can showcase the alternative means of information. The public is
28 not being denied information nor is this process taking place in secrecy. Rather, seeing

1 the faces and emotions of those involved are not integral facts to which the media and
2 the public need to be privy. Therefore, the Court should deny the right of these
3 proceedings to become public.

4 **III.CONCLUSION**

5 The Court should deny the request to allow the media presence during the
6 hearing of the instant case. This is an extraordinary matter with a seven (7) month-old
7 baby, who, as a result of a tragedy, became an orphan. Palmer’s parents were tragically
8 murdered by the grandfather of her half-siblings. Palmer will grow up in an
9 environment of hurt, knowing the circumstances that have made her an orphan. The
10 entire legal community was affected by the untimely death of Palmer’s parents. The
11 media spared no details in their speculations about these events. Undersigned counsel
12 does not object to the *documents* in this case being made public, but there is no reason
13 for videos of this family’s dispute, showing the faces of all parties involved in this
14 case, to be broadcast for the world to see, to be maintained on the internet for all time.

15 A baby’s safety and well-being are at issue in this case, and provide the Court
16 with an overriding basis to maintain some level of privacy for this child and her
17 caretakers. In this case, overriding privacy interest can be balanced with the public’s
18 right to access simply by maintaining contact information and video recordings
19 private, while keeping all other filings and records in this case open to the public.

20 //
21 //
22 //
23 //
24 //
25 //
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

The Court should deny the right of these proceedings to become public. Based upon the foregoing, Petitioners request the Court enter the following:

1. An Order denying Alex Falconi’s request to Broadcast, Record, Photograph or Televisе the Hearing; and
2. For such other relief deemed just and equitable by the court under the circumstances.

DATED this 19th day of July 2024

NAIMI MULLINS LAW GROUP

/s/Ilan Acherman
Jason Naimi, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9441
Neil M. Mullins, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 3544
Ilan Acherman, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 12320
NAIMI MULLINS LAW GROUP
efile@naimilaw.com
10000 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 160
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
Telephone: 702.901.4800

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of NAIMI MULLINS LAW GROUP, and that on this 19th day of July 2024, I served a copy *Objection to Broadcast, Record, and Photograph or Televisе the Hearing* as follows:

pursuant to EDCR 8.05(a), EDCR 8.05(f), NRCP 5(b)(2)(D) and Administrative Order 14-2 captioned “in the Administrative Matter of Mandatory Electronic Service in Eighth Judicial District Court,” by mandatory electronic service through the Eighth Judicial District Court’ electronic filing system; and/or

pursuant to EDCR 8.05(a) and NRCP 5(b)(2)(D), because the individual listed is not registered with the Court’s **mandatory** e-service system, via electronic mail or facsimile; and/or

by placing same to be depositing for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed envelope upon which first class mail postage was prepaid in Las Vegas, Nevada;

To the individual(s) listed below at the address, email address and facsimile number indicated below.

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Amanda Connor | amanda@connorpllc.com |
| Megan McDonald | megan@connorpllc.com |
| Marina Dalia-Hunt, Esq. | mdaliahunt@lacsн.org |
| Julie A Fox | jfox@lacsн.org |
| Amanda Connor | amanda@connorpllc.com |
| Megan McDonald | megan@connorpllc.com |
| Austrey T. Dwigginс | adwigginс@sdfnvlaw.com |
| Dana A. Dwigginс | ddwigginс@sdfnvlaw.com |
| Ross E. Evans | revans@sdfnvlaw.com |
| Laura A. Deeter, Esq. | laura@ghandilaw.com |
| Zuri Mendoza | zm@ghandilaw.com |
| Amy Robinson | ajr@ghandilaw.com |
| Alex Falconi | admin@ournevadajudges.com |

/s/ John Pollock
An employee of Naimi Mullins Law Group