7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

2

3

4

5

6

7

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 4. Appellant amended the notice of appeal from which Case No. 59691 originated to include the subsequent attorneys' fees order, with only the date of the Notice of the Entry of the Order left blank.
- However, Respondent did not file a notice of entry of order of the fee 5. award. As a result, the deadline to file the amended notice of appeal was not triggered, and the amended notice of appeal was not completed and filed.
- The lack of a notice of entry of order was discovered during 6. preparation of the appendix in this matter on August 12, 2013.
- 7. On August 13, 2013, Appellant undertook to file the delayed notice of entry of order, and on the same day, also filed an Amended Notice of Appeal challenging the attorney fee award.
- 8. The Amended notice of appeal conformed to the requirements of NRAP 4
- Appellant challenges the propriety of the attorney's fee and costs 9. award on 2 grounds: 1) the order should be reversed because it is based on an improper dismissal of the complaint, and 2) a lack of evidence in the record to support the findings therein. Thus, one ground for the challenge can be determined only with reference to the appeal in Case No. 59691.
- Appellant's Opening Brief in Case No. 59691, filed August 14, 2013, includes the arguments addressing the challenged attorney fees challenging the attorney fee order.
- On August 14, 2013, Appellant learned that this Court had docketed 11. the amended notice of appeal as a new and separate appeal, rather than as a part of the existing appeal.
 - Appellant has paid the requested fee for a new appeal. 12.

	13.	Pursuant to this Court's order dated August 14, 2013, Appellant has	
also filed the required Case Appeal Statement, and will, if no ruling is made prior to			
the deadline for such filing, file the Docketing Statement.			
	14.	However, judicial economy would best be served by permitting these	

14. However, judicial economy would best be served by permitting these two issues to be resolved together in one appeal. The issues are inextricably entwined; indeed, this Court could not determine the propriety of the costs awarded herein to Respondent as prevailing party without first reviewing the propriety of the dismissal of the complaint. Moreover, Appellant has already briefed the issues raised in this appeal, in the Opening Brief in Case. No.59691, and Appellant had properly filed an amended notice of appeal as required to vest this Court with jurisdiction over the issues.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, Appellant respectfully requests that this Court direct the clerk of this Court to (1) transfer to Docket No. 59691 the amended notice of appeal, (2) refund the filing fee paid in Docket No. 62832; and (3) administratively close Docket No. 63804.

Respectfully submitted this 20th day of August 2013.

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

Tami D. Cowden, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 8994

Mark E. Ferrario, Esq.

Nevada Bar No 1625

3773 Howard Hughes Parkway

Ste. 400 N

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Attorneys for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on August 20, 2013, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Transfer Amended Notice of Appeal to Case No. 59691, was served by United States Mail, first class, on counsel of record for all parties to the action below in this matter, as follows:

Albert G. Marquis, Esq.
Tye S. Hanseen, Esq.
10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
Attorneys for Respondent William Gang

An employee of GREENBERG TRAURIG