## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAMES MONTELL CHAPPELL, Appellant, vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA, Respondent. No. 61967



AUG 2 1 2014

TRACIE-K. LINDEMAN

## ORDER DENYING MOTION

Appellant has filed a motion requesting a second extension of time (60 days) to file a reply brief. When we granted appellant's prior motion for an extension of time in part, we cautioned that no further extensions of time would be permitted absent demonstration of extraordinary circumstances and extreme need. NRAP 31(b)(3)(D). In support of the current motion counsel cites the length of the opening and answering briefs and unidentified complex issues. Counsel also points out that this is an appeal from a murder conviction for which appellant was sentenced to death.

These same grounds were asserted in support of appellant's first extension motion and we conclude appellant has not shown extraordinary circumstances and extreme need warranting an additional 60-day extension of time. As noted in our prior order, the nature of alone does not constitute an appellant's offense sentence and extraordinary circumstance warranting an extension of time. The length of the answering brief does not constitute an extraordinary circumstance as that brief is well within the page and type-volume limitation of NRAP And counsel again fails to identify any complex issues 32(a)(7)(B). requiring additional time. Accordingly, the motion is denied.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA Appellant shall have until September 15, 2014, to file and serve the reply brief. No further extensions of time shall be permitted absent demonstration of extraordinary circumstances and extreme need. NRAP 31(b)(3)(D). Counsel's caseload normally will not be deemed such a circumstance. *Cf. Varnum v. Grady*, 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.

C.J.

cc: Christopher R. Oram Attorney General/Carson City Clark County District Attorney