1	NRCP 13 – Proposed
2	(Adopt federal rule with edits)
3	Rule 13. Counterclaim and Crossclaim
4	(a) Compulsory Counterclaim.
5	(1) In General. A pleading must state as a counterclaim any claim
6	that—at the time of its service—the pleader has against an opposing party if the
7	claim:
8	(A) arises out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject
9	matter of the opposing party's claim; and
10	(B) does not require adding another party over whom the court
11	cannot acquire jurisdiction.
12	(2) Exceptions. The pleader need not state the claim if:
13	(A) when the action was commenced, the claim was the subject of
14	another pending action; or
15	(B) the opposing party sued on its claim by attachment or other
16	process that did not establish personal jurisdiction over the pleader on that claim,
17	and the pleader does not assert any counterclaim under this rule.
18	(b) Permissive Counterclaim. A pleading may state as a counterclaim
19	against an opposing party any claim that is not compulsory.
20	(c) Relief Sought in a Counterclaim. A counterclaim need not diminish or
21	defeat the recovery sought by the opposing party. It may request relief that exceeds
22	in amount or differs in kind from the relief sought by the opposing party.
23	(d) Counterclaim Against the <u>United</u> States . These rules do not expand
24	the right to assert a counterclaim—or to claim a credit—against the United States

or a United States officer or agency.its political subdivisions, their agencies and
 entities, or any current or former officer or employee thereof.

(e) **Counterclaim Maturing or Acquired After Pleading.** The court may permit a party to file a supplemental pleading asserting a counterclaim that matured or was acquired by the party after serving an earlier pleading.

(f) [Abrogated.]

(g) **Crossclaim Against a Coparty.** A pleading may state as a crossclaim any claim by one party against a coparty if the claim arises out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the original action or of a counterclaim, or if the claim relates to any property that is the subject matter of the original action. The crossclaim may include a claim that the coparty is or may be liable to the crossclaimant for all or part of a claim asserted in the action against the crossclaimant.

(h) **Joining Additional Parties.** <u>Rules-NRCP</u> 19 and 20 govern the addition of a person as a party to a counterclaim or crossclaim.

(i) Separate Trials; Separate Judgments. If the court orders separate trials under <u>NRCPRule</u> 42(b), it may enter judgment on a counterclaim or crossclaim under <u>NRCPRule</u> 54(b) when it has jurisdiction to do so, even if the opposing party's claims have been dismissed or otherwise resolved.

3

4

(1)

NRCP 13 – Proposed (Subcommittee notes to the Committee)

NRCP 13 and 14 have interrelated unanswered questions associated with them. In addressing these questions, the subcommittee followed the theory that the rules should encourage all claims to be joined in one action, subject to the district court's ability to manage the litigation by bifurcating or severing unrelated claims. *See Schwab v. Erie Lackawanna R. Co.*, 438 F.2d 62, 68-69 (3d Cir. 1971) (stating that the general premise of the FRCP is "the theory that no inconvenience can result from the joinder of any two or more matters in the pleadings, but only from trying two or more matters together which have little or nothing in common.").

a. NRCP 13 and 14 do not address whether a crossclaim can be brought can be brought by a third-party defendant against a defendant, and vice versa. The rules can be interpreted narrowly to require such claims to proceed via NRCP 14, in which case the defendant or third-party defendant is treated as a non-party with regard to the other, limiting their initial claims against each other to indemnity-related claims. NRCP 14(a)(1). Alternatively, the rules can be interpreted broadly, allowing initial claims as crossclaims under NRCP 13(g) if the claim arises out of the transaction or occurrence. As defendants and third-party defendants are already parties to the action, the Subcommittee proposes the broad approach, treating them as "coparties" so that they may bring crossclaims against one another under NRCP 13(g). Changes to NRCP 14 have been made accordingly.

-3-

For additional information, see 6 Wright & Miller, Fed. Prac. & Proc.
Civ. § 1431 (3d ed. 2017); Arthur F. Greenbaum, Jacks or Better to
Open: Procedural Limitations on Co-Party and Third-Party Claims, 74
Minn. L. Rev. 507 (1990); see also Georgia Ports Auth. v. Construzioni
Meccaniche Industriali Genovesi, S.P.A., 119 F.R.D. 693, 695 (S.D. Ga.
1988) ("[T]he Court construes "co-party" to mean any party that is not
an opposing party."). This also avoids having to treat an existing
"party" to the action as a "nonparty" under NRCP 14.

b. There is also some disagreement among the courts as to whether parties may "shift" status from "coparties" to "opposing parties." See, e.g., Greenbaum, 74 Minn. L. Rev. at 551. Most courts recognize that the rules are to be flexibly applied, and that a party's status may shift in relation to another party depending on what claims, crossclaims, counterclaims, and third-party claims are made during the litigation. For example, two defendants would be coparties until one asserts a crossclaim against the other, at which time they become opposing parties, and the answering crossdefendant is subject to the compulsory and permissive counterclaim rules under NRCP 13(a) and (b). Even with the crossclaim, it is possible that the two defendants might still be deemed "coparties" when faced with action from the plaintiff.

(2) FRCP 13(f) is followed, abrogating the rule, as it is duplicative of NRCP 15 governing amendments to the pleadings.

(3) NRCP 13(d) is modified to encompass application to this state.