

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PRINCIPAL INVESTMENTS, INC.
D/B/A RAPID CASH; GRANITE
FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC. D/B/A
RAPID CASH; FMMR INVESTMENTS,
INC. D/B/A RAPID CASH; PRIME
GROUP, INC. D/B/A RAPID CASH; AND
ADVANCE GROUP, INC. D/B/A RAPID
CASH,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
ELIZABETH GOFF GONZALEZ,
DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

CASSANDRA HARRISON; EUGENE
VARCADOS; CONCEPCION
QUINTINO; AND MARY DUNGAN,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 57371

FILED

APR 27 2012

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK


ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY

Petitioners have filed a motion for leave to file a reply to real parties in interest's answer to the petition for en banc reconsideration. Real parties in interest oppose the motion, stating that the proposed reply addresses a matter beyond the answer by discussing petitioners' request to consolidate this matter with two other appeals, which was raised by petitioners in a separate motion.¹ Real parties in interest also state that

¹We defer ruling on petitioners' motion to consolidate this matter with the appeals in Docket Nos. 57265 and 59837.

the six-page reply does not comply with NRAP 28(c) because it is longer than five pages. Having considered the parties' arguments, we grant the motion to file a reply. Accordingly, the clerk of this court shall detach from petitioners' motion and file the reply, which was received in this court on April 5, 2012.²

It is so ORDERED.

, C.J.

cc: Hon. Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Judge
Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Gordon & Silver, Ltd.
Lewis & Roca, LLP/Las Vegas
Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
Eighth District Court Clerk

²Petitioners' request that we treat their opposition to the motion to consolidate as a sur-reply to petitioners' reply to real parties in interest's answer to the extent that the reply addresses the consolidation request. We deny real parties in interest's request as unnecessary, as this court will address the issue of consolidation after considering the parties' arguments raised in the separate motion, opposition, and reply.