

NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT ADVANCE SHEETS
310 NEBRASKA REPORTS
IN RE ESTATE OF LAKIN
Cite as 310 Neb. 389

IN RE ESTATE OF CHARLES E. LAKIN, DECEASED.
CHARLES E. LAKIN FOUNDATION, INC., APPELLANT, v.
THOMAS PRIBIL AND WILLIAM KILZER, COPERSONAL
REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ESTATE OF
CHARLES E. LAKIN, APPELLEES.

IN RE TRUST OF CHARLES E. LAKIN, DECEASED.
CHARLES E. LAKIN FOUNDATION, INC., APPELLANT, v.
THOMAS PRIBIL AND WILLIAM KILZER, COTRUSTEES
OF THE CHARLES E. LAKIN REVOCABLE
TRUST, ET AL., APPELLEES.

___ N.W.2d ___

Filed November 19, 2021. Nos. S-20-093, S-20-094.

SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION

Appeals from the County Court for Douglas County:
STEPHANIE S. SHEARER, Judge. Former opinion modified.
Motions for rehearing overruled.

Zachary W. Lutz-Priefert, Frederick D. Stehlik, William J. Lindsay, Jr., and John A. Svoboda, of Gross & Welch, P.C., L.L.O., for appellant.

Edward D. Hotz, Amanda M. Forker, and Benjamin C. Deaver, of Pansing, Hogan, Ernst & Bachman, L.L.P., for defendants-appellees Thomas L. Pribil and William A. Kilzer.

Trenten P. Bausch and Megan S. Wright, of Cline, Williams, Wright, Johnson & Oldfather, L.L.P., for appellee Thomas L. Pribil in his individual capacity.

NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT ADVANCE SHEETS
310 NEBRASKA REPORTS
IN RE ESTATE OF LAKIN
Cite as 310 Neb. 389

Cathy S. Trent-Vilim and Brian J. Brislen, of Lamson, Dugan & Murray, L.L.P., for appellee William A. Kilzer, an individual.

HEAVICAN, C.J., CASSEL, STACY, FUNKE, and FREUDENBERG, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

This case is before us on three motions for rehearing filed by the appellees, Thomas Pribil and William Kilzer—in their individual capacities and their capacities as copersonal representatives and cotrustees—concerning our opinion in *In re Estate of Lakin*.¹ While there is no substantive merit to the motions, Pribil and Kilzer point out that this court incorrectly found that the check used to pay Pribil was not in our record. The check appears in exhibit 59.

We overrule the motions, but modify the original opinion to substitute language as follows. In the paragraph under the subheading “7. § 6-1437,” we withdraw the third and fourth sentences and substitute: “Our record is not clear on the source of the payment and the capacity of the person making the payment.”

The remainder of the opinion shall remain unmodified.

FORMER OPINION MODIFIED.

MOTIONS FOR REHEARING OVERRULED.

MILLER-LERMAN and PAPIK, JJ., not participating.

¹ *In re Estate of Lakin*, 310 Neb. 271, 965 N.W.2d 365 (2021).