IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DAIMON MONROE A/K/A DAIMON DEVI HOYT, Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent. No. 52788

DEC 1 0 2009 TRACIE K. LINDEMAN CLERK OF SUPREME COURT BY _______ DEPUTY CLERK

FILED

ORDER GRANTING MOTION

Cause appearing, the motion for an extension of time to file the reply brief is granted. NRAP 31(a)(1). Appellant shall have until February 4, 2010, to file and serve the reply brief. Given the length of this initial extension request, no further extensions of time shall be permitted absent demonstration of extreme and unforeseeable circumstances. Counsel's caseload will not be deemed such a circumstance. <u>Cf. Varnum v.</u> <u>Grady</u>, 90 Nev. 374, 528 P.2d 1027 (1974). Failure to file a timely reply brief may be treated as a waiver of the right to file a reply brief. NRAP 28(c).

It is so ORDERED.

1 Sarlesty CJ

09.29903

cc: Law Offices of Martin Hart, LLC Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A 🕬