Exhibit 1

Exhibit 1

1 2			FILED Electronically 02-07-2012:11:29:21 AM Joey Orduna Hastings Clerk of the Court Transaction # 2748537		
3		_			
4		F	lectronically Filed eb 08 2012 12:09 p.m.		
5			racie K. Lindeman		
6	IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT		EOP NEVADA SING COS		
7	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY * * *	OF WASHUE			
8	MARK B. STEPPAN,				
9					
10	Plaintiff,	Case No:	CV07-00341		
11 12	vs.	(Consolidate	d with CV07-01021)		
12		Dept. No.:	10		
14	JOHN ILIESCU, JR. and SONNIA ILIESCU, as Trustees of the JOHN ILIESCU, JR. AND SONNIA ILIESCU 1992 FAMILY TRUST				
15 16	AGREEMENT; JOHN ILIESCU, individually; DOES I-V, inclusive; and ROE CORPORATIONS VI-X, inclusive,				
17 18	Defendants.				
19					
20	AND RELATED MATTERS.				
21	ORDER CERTIFYING INTENT TO GRANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION				
22	Presently before the Court is a Motion for Lea				
23	filed by Plaintiff MARK B. STEPPAN (hereafter "Plaint				
24	on November 21, 2011, Defendants JOHN ILIESCU, JR. and SONNIA ILIESCU, as Trustees				
25	of the JOHN ILIESCU, JR. AND SONNIA ILIESCU 199				
26	JOHN ILIESCU (hereafter, collectively, "Defendants") filed an Opposition to Steppan's				
27	Motion for Leave to File Motion for Reconsideration. Thereafter, on December 1, 2011,				
28	Plaintiff filed a Reply in Support of Motion for Leave	to File Motion	for Reconsideration.		

The following day, on December 1, 2011, Plaintiff filed a Request for Submission, thereby 1 submitting the matter for the Court's consideration. However, on December 22, 2011, 2 Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal, appealing this Court's Order Granting Defendants Iliescus' 3 Motion to Dismiss. 4

Pursuant to NRS 177.155, the Nevada Supreme Court has sole jurisdiction over a matter from the time an appellant files a Notice of Appeal until the Remittitur issues to the district court. Buffington v. State, 110 Nev. 124, 126, 686 P.2d 643, 644 (1994). A motion for reconsideration is not a tolling motion pursuant to NRAP 4(a)(2), and the district court thus lacks jurisdiction to grant a motion for reconsideration after a timely notice of appeal has been filed. Chapman Industries v. United Ins. Co. of America, 110 Nev. 454, 458, 874 10 P.2d 739, 741 (1994) (citing Alvis v. State, Gaming Control Bd., 99 Nev. 184, 660 P.2d 980 11 (1983)). 12

Based on the above, it is clear that this Court lacks jurisdiction to grant Plaintiff's 13 Motion for Reconsideration. Nonetheless, the Nevada Supreme Court has held that a 14 district court may certify its intent to grant a motion for reconsideration if it would be 15 inclined to do so following remand by the Nevada Supreme Court. See Huneycutt v. 16 Huneycutt, 94 Nev. 79, 575 P.2d 585 (1978); Foster v. Dingwall, ____ Nev. ____, 228 P.3d 17 453 (2010) (clarifying and more fully explaining the certification process announced in 18 19 Honeycutt).

After reviewing the pleadings and arguments of the parties, the Court is inclined to 20 grant reconsideration of its October 25, 2011 Order Granting Defendants Iliescus' Motion to 21 Dismiss. Accordingly, the Court hereby certifies its intent to grant the requested relief pursuant to Huneycutt v. Huneycutt, 94 Nev. 79, 575 P.2d 585.

22 23 24 25 26 27

28

5

6

7

8

9

DATED this <u>7</u> day of February, 2012.

EVEN P. ELLIOTT District Judge

-2-

	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
1		
2	I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by	
3	using the ECF system which served the following parties electronically:	
4	GREGORY WILSON, ESQ. for JOHN SCHLEINING	
5	THOMAS HALL, ESQ. for TRUSTEE OF THE JOHN ILIESCU, JR. & SONNIA ILLIESCU, JOHN	
6	ILIESCU, JR., SONNIA ILIESCU	
7	DAVID GRUNDY, ESQ. for KAREN DENNISON, HOLLAND & HART, LLP, JERRY SNYDER, R.	
8	HOWARD, HALE LANE PEEK DENNISON HOWARD	
9 10	MICHAEL HOY, ESQ. for MARK STEPPAN	
11	7 Jan 6 Fahrman 2012	
12	DATED this day of February, 2012.	
13	Jen Howden	
14	HEIDI HOWDEN Judicial Assistant	
15		
16		
17		
18	· · ·	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	-3-	

1		
2	HOY & HOY, P.C. Michael D. Hoy (NV Bar 2723)	
3	Michael S. Kimmel (NV Bar 9081) 4741 Caughlin Parkway, Suite Four	Electronically Filed
4	Reno, Nevada 89519 775.786.8000 (voice)	Feb 17 2012 03:33 p.m.
5	775.786.7426 (fax)	Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court
6	Attorneys for: Mark B. Steppan	
7		
8	In the Supreme Court	of the State of Nevada
9	Mark B. Steppan,	Case No. 60036
10	Appellant,	
11	vs.	
12	JOHN ILIESCU, JR.; SONNIA SANTEE ILIESCU; John Iliescu, Jr. and Sonnia Santee Iliescu, as	
13	trustees of the JOHN ILIESCU, JR. AND SONNIA	
14	ILIESCU 1992 FAMILY TRUST, Respondents.	
15	And Related Cross-Appeal.	
16		

Application for Order Shortening Time

Mark B. Steppan ("Steppan"), by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby moves for an order to shorten the time within which briefing must occur on Steppan's Motion for Remand. Good cause exists for this Application as Steppan's claims may be effectively barred by NRCP 41(e) if not brought to trial prior to May 4, 2007.

The underlying Complaint in this matter was filed on May 4, 2007. Pursuant to NRCP 41(e), the court "shall" dismiss any action which is not brought to trial within five years after the plaintiff has filed the action. In certain circumstances, a new three year period within which to bring a case to trial will arise after remittitur from appeal. *Id.* Because the underlying action did

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

not proceed to judgment, there will be no extension of the NRCP 41(e) five year rule (absent stipulation by the parties).

Steppan's underlying claims, the same claims for which his appeal was taken, relate to the foreclosure of his mechanics lien. NRS 108.233(1) mandates that a lien "must not bind" property for a period of longer than 6 months after the date on which the lien was recorded. If Steppan's foreclosure complaint is dismissed as a result of the five year rule, Steppan's lien will arguably become stale and he will be unable to file a new action to foreclose upon the lien. In this case, dismissal without prejudice is tantamount to a complete forfeiture of Steppan's lien rights (rights he pursued through four years of litigation, the exchange of 10,000 pages of documents, ten days of depositions, and days of settlement conference.)

Steppan asks this Court to shorten to three days the time within which Respondents must file and serve their opposition. Doing so will enable full consideration by the Court after briefing and still provide sufficient time for the matter to proceed to trial within the constraints of NRCP 41(e).

Based on the foregoing, Steppan respectfully requests the Court set February 22nd as the date by which Respondents must oppose Steppan's Motion to Remand and February 24th as the date by which Steppan must file his reply in support of motion to remand (if any) in response to Respondents' oppositions (if any).

23

///

///

///

///

- 24 25
- 26 ///
- 27

28

1	Privacy Certification		
2	Undersigned counsel certifies that this document does not contain any social security		
3	numbers.		
4	February 17, 2012. Hoy & Hoy, PC		
5			
6	<u>/s/ Michael S. Kimmel</u>		
7	Michael D. Hoy (NV Bar 2723) Michael S. Kimmel (NV Bar 9081) 4741 Caughlin Parkway, Suite Four		
8	Reno, Nevada 89519 775.786.8000 (voice)		
9	775.786.7426 (fax)		
10	Attorneys for: Mark B. Steppan		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1	Certificate of Service		
2	Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of Hoy & Hoy, PC, and		
3	that on the 17th day of February 2012, I electronically filed a true and correct copy of the		
4 5	foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system, which served the		
6	following parties electronically:		
7	DAVID R. GRUNDY		
8	ALICE CAMPOS MERCADO		
9	GREGORY F. WILSON		
10	Further, I hereby certify that, on the date below, I served a true and correct copy of the		
11 12	foregoing document by depositing a copy of the same for mailing enclosed in a sealed envelope		
12	upon which first class postage was fully prepaid addressed to the following:		
14	Gordon Cowan		
15	10775 Double R. Blvd. Reno, Nevada 89521		
16	David Wasick		
17	879 Mahogany Drive Minden, Nevada 89423		
18	DATED this 17th day of February, 2012.		
19			
20 21	<u>/s/ Kelly Anderson</u> An employee of Hoy & Hoy		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	- 4 -		

