

1992

Keith C. Holt and Joyce S. Holt v. Manuel Katsanevas : Reply Brief

Utah Court of Appeals

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Original Brief Submitted to the Utah Court of Appeals; digitized by the Howard W. Hunter Law Library, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

Nick J. Colessides; Attorney for Katsanevas.

Earl D. Tanner, Jr.; Tanner, Bowen, & Tanner; Attorneys for Holts.

Recommended Citation

Reply Brief, *Holt v. Katsanevas*, No. 920225 (Utah Court of Appeals, 1992).

https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1/3148

This Reply Brief is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Court of Appeals Briefs by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. Policies regarding these Utah briefs are available at

http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah_court_briefs/policies.html. Please contact the Repository Manager at hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu with questions or feedback.

BRIEF

UTAH
DOCUMENT
KFU
50
.A10
DOCKET NO. 920225

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

KEITH C. HOLT and JOYCE S. HOLT,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs/Appellants,	:	REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANTS
	:	
vs.	:	
	:	
MANUEL KATSANEVAS,	:	Appellate No. 920225-CA
	:	
Defendant/Appellee.	:	Priority No. 16

Appeal from the Third District Court, Judge Brian

Nick J. Colessides, Esq.
Attorney for Katsanevas
466 South 400 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 521-4441

Earl D. Tanner, Jr., Esq.
TANNER, BOWEN, & TANNER
Attorneys for Holts
1020 Beneficial Life Tower
36 South State Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 538-2021

FILED

JUN 30 1992

Earl D. Tanner, Jr. #3188
TANNER, BOWEN & TANNER
1020 Beneficial Life Tower
36 South State Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 538-2021

Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Appellants

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

KEITH C. HOLT and JOYCE S. HOLT,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs/Appellants,	:	REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANTS
	:	
vs.	:	
	:	
MANUEL KATSANEVAS,	:	Appellate No. 920225-CA
	:	
Defendant/Appellee.	:	Priority No. 16

Plaintiffs and Appellants Keith C. Holt and Joyce S. Holt, by and through their attorney, submit the following reply to the brief of defendant Manuel Katsanevas.

Many of the Holts' disagreements with the assertions and arguments of Mr. Katsanevas are apparent in comparing the Briefs already submitted. Rather than reiterate, this Reply notes two disagreements which may not be readily apparent.

Mr. Katsanevas asserts that the following is a material uncontroverted fact:

6. On or about November 10, 1982, defendant requested and received a letter from plaintiffs, whereby the plaintiffs agreed to the exchange, and the subordination of Holts' interest in the 'new' North Temple location, and the payment of the ' . . . indebtedness in the approximate amount of \$50,000.00.': See Addendum Exhibit 7 and

Addendum Exhibit 15, R-00098 to 200103.
Katsanevas Brief at p. 5.

In the Affidavit of Keith C. Holt, Exhibit 8 to Holts' Brief, Record 138-139, Mr. Holt states that:

2. I have reviewed Manuel Katsanevas' Exhibit B, dated November 10, 1982, and I do not recall seeing it before and it has not been previously produced by Mr. Katsanevas.

The Exhibit B mentioned in Mr. Holt's Affidavit is the same document as Mr. Katsanevas' Addendum Exhibit 7. The Court should note that it is unsigned.

Mr. Katsanevas' Brief makes two inaccurate statements about the Second Affidavit of Keith C. Holt and Affidavit of Robert A. Bailey (Record pp. 209-219, 205-207):

However, the trial court properly excluded the irrelevant and inadmissible evidence of the Bailey Affidavit . . .
Katsanevas Brief, p. 17.


. . . the trial court properly excluded the irrelevant and inadmissible part of the Second Holt Affidavit . . .
Katsanevas Brief, p. 18.

While it is true that Mr. Katsanevas' counsel filed an objection and motion to strike the affidavits, the objection and motion were never noticed up, were not argued at the hearing on plaintiff's motions, and have not been ruled upon.

The Holts' grounds for appeal have not been challenged. Summary judgment against them was improper in light of the conflicting evidence concerning an oral agreement between the parties that was taken out of the statute of frauds by part

performance. The Holts respectfully urge this Court to vacate both the Summary Judgment and Memorandum Decision entered below.

DATED this 29th day of June, 1992.




Earl D. Tanner, Jr.
Attorney for Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 30th day of June, 1992,
four true and correct copies of the foregoing REPLY BRIEF OF
APPELLANTS were hand delivered to:

Nick J. Colessides, Esq.
Attorney for Appellee
466 South 400 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111



45.35