


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PIERRE A. HASCHEFF,
Appellant/Cross-Respondent,
vs.
LYNDA HASCHEFF,
Respondent/Cross-Appellant.

No. 86976

FILED

DEC 13 2023

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER GRANTING MOTION

Respondent/cross-appellant has filed a motion for leave to file an opposition to the motion for judicial notice that exceeds the permissible page limitation. *See* NRAP 27(d)(2). The motion is granted. The opposition was filed on December 11, 2023. Appellant/cross-respondent shall have 7 days from the date of this order to file and serve any reply.

The parties have also filed a stipulation to extend the deadlines to file various documents in this matter. The stipulation is improperly signed electronically by attorney Therese Shanks, counsel for appellant/cross-respondent. *See* NRAP 25(a)(5) (requiring an original signature of counsel of record on documents submitted by a represented party); NEFCR 11(c)(1), (2) (requiring that when a stipulation is electronically filed, the party filing the document must first obtain the signature of the other party or person on a printed form of the document, then scan and submit the stipulation in a manner that accurately reproduces the original signature and content of the document). Accordingly, the stipulation is treated as a motion filed by counsel for respondent/cross-appellant.

The motion for an extension of time for respondent/cross-appellant to file the answering brief on appeal and opening brief on cross-

appeal is granted. NRAP 31(b). Respondent/cross-appellant shall have until January 17, 2024, to file and serve the combined answering brief on appeal and opening brief on cross-appeal. Failure to timely file and serve the combined brief may result in the imposition of sanctions. NRAP 31(d).

The motion for an extension of time for appellant/cross-respondent to file replies in support of his pending motions is denied because the motion is not signed by counsel for appellant/cross-respondent and respondent/cross-appellant cannot seek relief on behalf of appellant/cross-respondent.

It is so ORDERED.

 Stigler , C.J.

cc: Fennemore Craig P.C./Reno
Leonard Law, PC
Woodburn & Wedge