

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANDREW YOUNG,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

ANDREW YOUNG,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

✓ No. 83243 **FILED**

APR 19 2022

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

No. 84412 *S. Young*  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS*

Appellant was originally charged with several theft offenses and with additional charges of attempted murder with use of a deadly weapon and battery with use of a deadly weapon causing substantial bodily harm. The district court severed the theft charges from the attempted murder and battery charges, and two trials were conducted. Docket No. 83243 is a direct appeal from a judgment of conviction for the theft charges. The opening brief was filed on March 8, 2022. Docket No. 84412 is a direct appeal from an amended judgment of conviction that includes both the convictions for the theft offenses and the subsequent conviction for battery with use of a deadly weapon causing substantial bodily harm.


On March 15, 2022, this court entered an order denying appellant's motion in Docket No. 83243 to file a second amended opening brief and supplemental appendix to incorporate the new conviction. This court directed appellant to file a new notice of appeal from the amended judgment of conviction. That appeal has now been docketed in Docket No. 84412. Appellant has separate counsel for the theft convictions and the

battery conviction, and both counsel have filed motions seeking guidance on how to proceed with briefing.

Both appeals shall proceed according to their respective briefing schedules. The renewed motion filed in Docket No. 83243 to file a second amended opening brief and supplemental appendix is denied.

Respondent in Docket No. 83243 has filed a motion for an extension of time to file the answering brief. The motion is granted. Respondent shall have until July 6, 2022, to file and serve the answering brief addressing the convictions for the theft offenses. Given the length of this initial extension, no further extensions of time shall be permitted absent demonstration of extraordinary circumstances and extreme need. *Id.* Counsel's caseload normally will not be deemed such a circumstance. *Cf. Varnum v. Grady*, 90 Nev. 374, 528 P.2d 1027 (1974). Failure to timely file the answering brief may result in the imposition of sanctions.

It is so ORDERED.

 C. J.

cc: The Law Office of David R. Fischer  
Nancy Lemcke Law, LLC  
Yampolsky & Margolis  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Clark County District Attorney