Electronically Filed 1/26/2022 3:44 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT THĔ DICKERSON KARACSONYI LAW GROUP ROBERT P. DICKERSON, ESQ. 2 Nevada Bar No. 000945 JOSEF M. KARACSONYI, ESQ. 3 levada Bar No. 010634 4 SABRINA M. DOLSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 013105 1645 Village Center Circle, Suite 291 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134 6 Telephone: (702) 388-8600 Facsimile: (702) 388-0210 Email: info@thedklawgroup.com 8 Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaimant 9 10 DISTRICT COURT 11 FAMILY DIVISION 12 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 13 14 SUZANNE M. LEE, CASE NO. D-21-639697-D DEPT NO. J 1.5 Plaintiff/Counterdefendant, 16 ANSWER TO COMPLAINT 17 <u>COUNTERCLAIM FOR</u> DIVORCE DANIEL R. LEE, 18 Defendant/Counterclaimant. 19 20 ANSWER TO COMPLAINT FOR DIVORCE 21 COMES NOW Defendant, DANIEL LEE R. ("Dan" 22 "Defendant"), by and through his attorneys, ROBERT P. DICKERSON, 23 ESQ., JOSEF M. KARACSONYI, ESQ., and SABRINA M. DOLSON, 24 ESQ., of THE DICKERSON KARACSONYI LAW GROUP, and as and 25 for his Answer to the Complaint for Divorce (the "Complaint") filed herein 26 by Plaintiff, SUZANNE M. LEE ("Suzanne" or "Plaintiff"), admits, denies, 27 alleges, and states as follows: 28

Case Number: D-21-639697-D

28 | .

- 1. Defendant denies all allegations of Plaintiff's Complaint not specifically admitted herein.
- 2. Answering paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 13 of the Complaint, Defendant admits each and every allegation contained therein.
- 3. Answering paragraphs 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 of the Complaint, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information upon which to form a belief at this time as to the truth of the allegations contained therein, and, therefore, Defendant respectfully denies the same.
- 4. Answering paragraphs 6 and 12 of the Complaint, Defendant generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 5. Answering paragraph 9 of the Complaint, Defendant admits each party, Plaintiff and Defendant, owns separate property pursuant to and in accordance with the parties' Premarital Agreement they entered into prior to their marriage. Pursuant to the terms of that Premarital Agreement, each party's separate property should be confirmed to him or her as his or her sole and separate property.

COUNTERCLAIM FOR DIVORCE

COMES NOW Defendant/Counterclaimant, DANIEL R. LEE ("Dan" or "Defendant"), and as and for his Counterclaim for Divorce against Plaintiff/Counterdefendant, SUZANNE M. LEE ("Suzanne" or "Plaintiff"), alleges as follows:

I.

Dan is, and for more than six weeks immediately preceding the commencement of this action and the verification and filing of this Complaint has been, an actual bona fide resident and domiciliary of the County of Clark, State of Nevada, and during all of said period of time

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

Dan had and still has the intent to make the State of Nevada his home, residence, and domicile for an indefinite period of time.

II.

Dan and Suzanne were duly and legally married in Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, on April 22, 1995, and ever since said date have been and are now husband and wife.

III.

There is one (1) minor child born the issue of the parties' marriage, namely, Cody D. Lee, born June 18, 2004, who currently is seventeen (17) years of age. The parties have no other children the issue of their relationship, including any adopted children, who have yet to reach the legal age of majority, and, to the best of Dan's knowledge and belief, Suzanne is not pregnant.

IV.

Dan and Suzanne are fit and proper persons to have joint legal and joint physical custody of their minor child.

V.

Under the specific circumstances of this case, neither party should pay child support to the other party. In this regard, both Dan and Suzanne have a duty and legal obligation to provide the necessary maintenance, health care, education, and financial support for their minor Dan understands and acknowledges his legal obligation under Nevada law to contribute to the support of the parties' minor child. Dan will continue to meet and satisfy his legal duty, as well as his personal moral commitment, to his child. Suzanne likewise should satisfy her legal duty and obligation, as well as her personal moral commitment, to the parties' child.

VI.

8

9

10

1

12

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24 25

26 27

28

Both Dan and Suzanne have a legal obligation under Nevada law to share equally in the payment of their minor child's medical, surgical, dental, orthodontic, optical, and psychological expenses, as well as medical insurance coverage for their minor child. Dan recognizes and accepts his legal obligation to pay one-half (½) of all such medical and health related expenses for the child. Suzanne has the same legal obligation which she should recognize, and she should pay for one-half (½) of any cost for such medical insurance for the parties' minor child, as well as one-half (½) of the child's medical, surgical, dental, orthodontic, optical, and psychological expenses not covered by such medical insurance.

VII.

Prior to the parties' marriage, the parties entered into a Premarital Agreement ("Premarital Agreement").

VIII.

The parties' Premarital Agreement is a valid and binding agreement between the parties.

IX.

The parties' Premarital Agreement addresses, controls, and resolves all marital issues that exist between the parties which are incident to the parties' divorce.

X.

By way of their Premarital Agreement, the parties have set forth their mutual desire and intent to establish, determine, and settle between themselves all of their relative property rights and interests with respect to each other, including, without limitation, all rights of either party to be supported by the other party.

XI.

By way of their Premarital Agreement, the parties have set forth their mutual desire and intent to define all of their respective rights in any property that each owned at the time of their marriage to each other, as well as any property either party has acquired during their marriage.

XII.

By way of their Premarital Agreement, each party has waived and relinquished the right to receive spousal support or alimony maintenance from the other party. Specifically, the Premarital Agreement provides as follows:

The parties expressly agree and acknowledge that the division and distribution of community property of the parties, as provide in this Agreement, upon the dissolution of the parties' marriage, is intended to be in lieu of any court ordered temporary or permanent support, rehabilitation payments or any other court ordered payments in the nature of spousal support, alimony, or attorney's fees and expressly renounce any and all rights to receive any such spousal support.

XIII.

All questions relating to the division of the parties' property, the assumption of their debts, the payment of alimony, and all other issues and claims, marital and otherwise, that exist between the parties have been and are resolved by the parties' Premarital Agreement. The parties' Premarital Agreement should be ratified, confirmed, approved, and enforced by the Court.

XIV.

Other than as expressly set forth in the parties' Premarital Agreement, all the property and assets owned by Dan are his sole and separate property, and the same should be confirmed to him as his sole and separate property.

XV.

Pursuant to the provisions of the parties' Premarital Agreement, Dan has significant separate property which should be confirmed to him as his sole and separate property. Similarly, to the extent Dan has any separate debt pursuant to the terms of the Premarital Agreement, the same should be confirmed to be his sole and separate debt.

XVI.

To the extent Suzanne has any separate property and/or separate debt pursuant to the terms of the parties' Premarital Agreement, the same should be confirmed to her as her sole and separate property and her sole and separate debt.

XVII.

Pursuant to the parties' Premarital Agreement, the parties may have acquired community property and community debt during their marriage. Any such community property and community debt should be equally divided between the parties.

XVIII.

Other than as expressly set forth in the parties' Premarital Agreement, the parties have no community or jointly owned property to be adjudicated by the Court.

XIX.

It has been necessary for Dan to retain the services of attorneys to represent him in this divorce action initiated by Suzanne. Should the Court determine that Suzanne has unnecessarily and unreasonably caused Dan to incur unnecessary legal expenses with respect to this divorce action, the Court should award Dan a reasonable sum to compensate him for the legal expenses he has incurred as a result of Suzanne's unreasonable or litigious actions or conduct. Otherwise, both Dan and Suzanne are well-

able to pay their own reasonable attorneys' fees and costs which each party should expect to reasonably incur for the purpose of terminating their marriage and resolving the issues involved in this case.

XX.

Dan and Suzanne are incompatible in their tastes, natures, views, likes, and dislikes, which have become so widely separate and divergent that the parties have been and currently are incompatible to such an extent that it now appears that there is no possibility of reconciliation between Dan and Suzanne. There currently remains such an incompatible temperament between Dan and Suzanne that a happy marital relationship can no longer exist.

WHEREFORE, Dan respectfully prays that the Court enter judgment as follows:

- 1. That Suzanne take nothing by virtue of her Complaint for Divorce.
- 2. That the bonds of matrimony now and heretofore existing between Dan and Suzanne be dissolved, set aside, and forever held for naught, and that Dan be awarded a Decree of Divorce, and the parties hereto and each of them be restored to their status of being a single, unmarried person.
- 3. That all the relief requested by Dan by way of his Counterclaim for Divorce be granted, awarded, and ordered by the Court.
- 4. That Dan and Suzanne be awarded joint legal and joint physical custody of their minor child.
- 5. That neither party be ordered to pay child support to the other party, particularly under the specific circumstances of this case.
- 6. That the parties be ordered to share equally in the cost required to provide and maintain medical and health insurance coverage for their

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
- l	4
- I	5
î I	6
î 1	7
	8
_	9
	0
2	1
	2
2 2	3
2 2	4
2 2	5
ے ص	<i>5</i>
2	7
	, 8
1	×

minor child, and that each party be ordered to pay one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) of all the child's medical, surgical, dental, orthodontic, optical, and psychological expenses not covered by such medical insurance.

- That neither party be ordered to pay alimony or spousal 7. support to the other party.
- 8. That all of Dan's separate property be confirmed to him as is sole and separate property.
- That the Court confirm to Suzanne any separate property she 9. may own.
 - 10. That the Court confirm to Dan any separate debt he may have.
- That the Court confirm to Suzanne any separate debt she may 11. have.
- 12. That, to the extent the parties have any community property and or community debt, the same be equally divided between the parties.
- For such other and further relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper in the premises, specifically including, but not limited to, an appropriate award of attorneys' fees and costs of suit to Dan under the circumstances set forth in paragraph XIX of his Counterclaim for Divorce.

DATED this 26 day of January, 2022.

THE DICKERSON KARACSONYI LAW GROUP

ROBERT P. DICKERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 000945

1645 Village Center Circle, Suite 291

Las Vegas, Nevada 89134 Attorneys for Defendant/ Counterclaimant

VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEVADA COUNTY OF CLARK

DANIEL R. LEE, being first duly sworn upon oath, deposes and says: That he is the Defendant/Counterclaimant in the above-entitled action; that he read the foregoing Answer to Complaint for Divorce and Counterclaim for Divorce and knows the contents thereof, and that the same is true of his own knowledge except for those matters therein stated on information and belief, and as for those matters, he believes the same to be true.

Subscriber and sworn to before me this 26 day of Languagy, 2022. by Daniel R. Lee.

Sati of Nevada Couply of Clark

Motary blic in and

County and State.

SUZANNE VALENCIA Notary Public, State of Nevada Appointment No. 05-99839-1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of THE 3 DICKERSON KARACSONYI LAW GROUP, and that on this 26th day of January, 2022, I caused the above and foregoing document entitled 4 ANSWER TO COMPLAINT FOR DIVORCE AND COUNTERCLAIM 5 FOR DIVORCE to be served as follows: 6 by mandatory electronic service through the Eighth Judicial District Court's electronic filing system; |X|8 by placing same to be deposited for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was prepaid in Las Vegas, Nevada; 9 10 to be sent via facsimile, by duly executed consent for service by 11 electronic means; 12 by hand-delivery with signed Receipt of Copy. 13 To the person(s) and/or attorney(s) listed below at the address, email 14 address, and/or facsimile number indicated below: 15 RADFORD J. SMITH, ESQ. GARIMA VÁRSHNEY, ESQ. 16 RADFORD J. SMITH, CHARTERED 2470 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 206 17 Henderson, Nevada 89074 18 Firm@radfordsmith.com Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant 19 20 21 /s/ Edwardo Martinez An employee of The Dickerson Karacsonyi Law Group 22 23 24 25 26 27 28