

**TULELAKE HORSERADISH, INC. VS. SANTA MARGARITA RANCH, LLC,
No. 69305, Order Affirming in Part, Reversing in Part and Remanding
(Unpublished Disposition, June 20, 2016)**

NRS 18.010(2) does not authorize an award of appellate attorney fees.

Thus, the Court did not need to consider whether the district court abused its discretion in declining to award more than \$12,600 for time frames 3 and 5. However, because respondents did not file a notice of cross-appeal from the district court's order, we lack jurisdiction to vacate the \$12,600 that was awarded.

Furthermore, the district court erred in failing to award appellant the full amounts requested for time frames 2 and 4. Pursuant to *Cf. Lyon v. Walker Boudwin Constr. Co.*, which recognized that a district court abuses its discretion when it fails to state a reason for denying a request for attorney fees, and in the absence of any specific arguments by respondents regarding the propriety of the amounts of fees requested for time frames 2 and 4, the Court concluded that the district court erred in failing to award appellant the full amounts requested for those time frames.