

NRCP 8 – Proposed (Adopt Federal rule with edits)

Rule 8. General Rules of Pleading

- (a) Claim for Relief. A pleading that states a claim for relief must contain:
- (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction, unless the court already has jurisdiction and the claim needs no new jurisdictional support;
- (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and
- (3) a demand for the relief sought, which may include relief in the alternative or different types of relief; and
- (4) if the pleader seeks more than \$15,000 in monetary damages, the demand for relief must request damages "in excess of \$15,000" without further specification of the amount.
 - (b) **Defenses**; **Admissions and Denials.**
 - (1) **In General.** In responding to a pleading, a party must:
- (A) state in short and plain terms its defenses to each claim asserted against it; and
 - (B) admit or deny the allegations asserted against it by an opposing party.
- (2) **Denials—Responding to the Substance.** A denial must fairly respond to the substance of the allegation.
- (3) **General and Specific Denials.** A party that intends in good faith to deny all the allegations of a pleading—including the jurisdictional grounds—may do so by a general denial. A party that does not intend to deny all the allegations must

either specifically deny designated allegations or generally deny all except those specifically admitted.

- (4) **Denying Part of an Allegation.** A party that intends in good faith to deny only part of an allegation must admit the part that is true and deny the rest.
- (5) **Lacking Knowledge or Information.** A party that lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of an allegation must so state, and the statement has the effect of a denial.
- (6) **Effect of Failing to Deny.** An allegation—other than one relating to the amount of damages—is admitted if a responsive pleading is required and the allegation is not denied. If a responsive pleading is not required, an allegation is considered denied or avoided.

(c) Affirmative Defenses.

- (1) **In General.** In responding to a pleading, a party must affirmatively state any avoidance or affirmative defense, including:
 - •<u>(A)</u> accord and satisfaction;
 - •(B) arbitration and award;
 - (C) assumption of risk;
 - •<u>(D)</u> contributory negligence;
 - (E) discharge in bankruptcy;
 - •(F) duress;
 - •(G) estoppel;
 - •(H) failure of consideration;
 - <u>**-**(I)</u> __fraud;
 - -(J) illegality;

<u>• (K)</u>	_injury	by fellow	servant;
--------------	---------	-----------	----------

- •(L) laches;
- •(M) license;
- •(N) payment;
- •(0) release;
- •<u>(P)</u> res judicata;
- •(Q) statute of frauds;
- (R) statute of limitations; and
- •(S) waiver.
- (2) **Mistaken Designation.** If a party mistakenly designates a defense as a counterclaim, or a counterclaim as a defense, the court must, if justice requires, treat the pleading as though it were correctly designated, and may impose terms for doing so.
- (d) Pleading to Be Concise and Direct; Alternative Statements; Inconsistency.
- (1) **In General.** Each allegation must be simple, concise, and direct. No technical form is required.
- (2) Alternative Statements of a Claim or Defense. A party may set out 2 or more statements of a claim or defense alternatively or hypothetically, either in a single count or defense or in separate ones. If a party makes alternative statements, the pleading is sufficient if any one of them is sufficient.
- (3) **Inconsistent Claims or Defenses.** A party may state as many separate claims or defenses as it has, regardless of consistency.
 - (e) Construing Pleadings. Pleadings must be construed so as to do justice.

DRAFTER'S NOTE—2017 AMENDMENT

NRCP 8 is amended to conform to the federal rule, with the addition of the
Nevada requirements for pleading monetary damages in NRCP 8(a)(4) and discharge
in bankruptcy as an affirmative defense. The Committee has also adopted the
federal requirement in NRCP 8(a)(1) to state the grounds for the court's jurisdiction;
this does not change the jurisdiction of the various Nevada courts. The previous
references in NRCP 8 to the applicability of Rule 11 were deleted as duplicative
because Rule 11 is applicable by its own terms. As noted in the Drafter's Note to
NRCP 12, by adopting the text of the federal rule the Committee does not intend any
change to existing Nevada case law regarding pleading standards, and leaves to
judicial development whether Nevada should adopt the plausibility analysis in
Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009), and Bell Atlantic Co. v. Twombly, 550
U.S. 544, 565-66 (2007).

NRCP 8 – Proposed (Subcommittee note to the Committee)

The text of FRCP 8 rearranges the text of NRCP 8. Most of the rule is substantively unchanged between the two. The exceptions are as follows:

- (1) NRCP 8(a)(1) is new and adopts FRCP 8(a)(1)'s requirement of a jurisdictional statement. This statement encompasses the amount in controversy and may apply to statutory procedures and rules applicable to courts with special jurisdiction, such as family courts.
- (2) The damages in excess of \$15,000 sentence in NRCP 8(a) is not present in the FRCP rule. This sentence has been retained, with edits to be consistent with the federal style. The old \$10,000 cap of Justice Court jurisdiction in NRS 4.370 was changed to \$15,000 by the 2015 Legislature effective Jan. 1, 2017.
- (3) The existing NRCP 8(b) and (e)(2) contain a statement about the applicability of Rule 11. As Rule 11 is applicable by its own terms, the Rule 11 comments were deleted as duplicative.
- (4) NRCP 8(c) lists discharge in bankruptcy as an affirmative defense that must be pled. This defense is retained in the list of affirmative defenses. Per discussion at the prior committee meeting, the list of affirmative defenses has been numbered.