

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RAYMOND RIAD KHOURY,
Appellant,
vs.
MARGARET SEASTRAND,
Respondent.

No. 64702

RAYMOND RIAD KHOURY,
Appellant,
vs.
MARGARET SEASTRAND,
Respondent.

No. 65007

RAYMOND RIAD KHOURY,
Appellant,
vs.
MARGARET SEASTRAND,
Respondent.

No. 65172

FILED

AUG 14 2015

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER GRANTING MOTION

Cause appearing, appellant's amended motion requesting a second extension of time to file the reply brief is granted. NRAP 31(b)(3)(B). Appellant shall have until August 28, 2015, to file and serve the reply brief. No further extensions of time shall be permitted absent demonstration of extraordinary circumstances and extreme need. *Id.* Counsel's caseload normally will not be deemed such a circumstance. *Cf. Varum 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.¹

1. Sanders, C.J.

cc: Lewis Roca Rothgerber LLP/Las Vegas
Houser & Allison, APC
Hall Jaffe & Clayton, LLP
Richard Harris Law Firm

¹Appellant's motion for an extension of time to file the reply brief is denied as moot.