

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**

**SEP 04 2015**

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

*ORDER GRANTING MOTION*

On August 14, 2015, this court entered an order granting appellant's motion for a second extension of time, until August 28, 2015, to file the reply brief. That order noted that no further extensions of time shall be permitted absent demonstration of extreme and unforeseeable circumstances, and that counsel's caseload will not be deemed such a circumstance.

Appellant has filed a motion requesting an additional 14-day extension of time to file the reply brief. The basis for the motion is counsel's obligations in preparing another case for oral argument. Although we cautioned that counsel's workload is not normally deemed an extraordinary circumstance warranting an extension, we conclude that in this case, the standard is met and we grant the motion. Appellant shall

have until September 11, 2015, to file and serve the reply brief. Any additional extensions will be granted only on showing of extreme and unforeseeable circumstances. Counsel's caseload 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.

Handwritten Signature, C.J.

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