IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 1 2 3 Electronically Filed KEITH MATHAHS, Petitioner, 4 Sep 17₉2012 09:26 a.m. CASE NO: Trăcie K. Lindeman 5 VS. D.C. NO: Clenacoff Supreme Court 6 THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF 7 NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE VALERIE ADAIR, 8 DISTRICT JUDGE 9 Respondent, 10 THE STATE OF NEVADA, Real Party in Interest. 11 MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME 12 (Second Request) 13 COMES NOW the State of Nevada, by STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark 14 County District Attorney, through his Deputy, RYAN J. MACDONALD, and 15 moves this Court for an enlargement of time within which to file Answer to 16 Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition. This motion is based on the 17 following memorandum, declaration of counsel and all papers and pleadings on 18 file herein. Dated this 17th day of September, 2012. 19 20 Respectfully submitted, 21 STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar # 001565 22 23 24 BY /s/ Ryan J. MacDonald RYÁN J. MACDONALD 25 Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #12615 26 Office of the Clark County District Attorney

27

28

1

2 3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

I, RYAN J. MACDONALD, am the supervising attorney in the abovecaptioned case. This Court may extend the time to file an Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition upon a showing of good cause. NRAP 26(b)(1).

MEMORANDUM

The State's Answer on the instant matter is currently due on September 14, This petition challenges the sufficiency of a 40-page Indictment in a complex, important, and constantly-evolving case. Despite this, Petitioner asserts that this Court need not consider any of the grand jury proceedings below when assessing whether extraordinary intervention in this matter is warranted. The State strongly disagrees and asserts that the appendix Petitioner has submitted is woefully insufficient. Accordingly, the State was compelled to assemble and review a Respondent's Appendix that consists of approximately 2,600 pages of complicated grand jury testimony.

Due to the above-described circumstances, the State submits that good cause exists to extend the filing due date and respectfully requests this Court's permission for an extension of time of FIVE (5) days to file its Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition, making the Answer due to be filed on or before September 21, 2012. This motion is made in good faith and not for purposes of undue delay.

Dated this 17th day of September, 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney

BY /s/Ryan J. MacDonald

RYAN J. MACDONALD Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #12615

Office of the Clark County District Attorney

I hereby certify and affirm that this document was

I hereby certify and affirm that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on September 17, 2012. Electronic Service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO Nevada Attorney General

MICHAEL V. CRISTALLI, ESQ. EUNICE M. MORGAN Counsels for Appellant

RYAN J. MACDONALD Deputy District Attorney

BY /s/ eileen davis
Employee, District Attorney's Office

RJM//ed