

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TIMOTHY TOM, AN INDIVIDUAL,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
INNOVATIVE HOME SYSTEMS, LLC,  
A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY,  
Respondent.

TIMOTHY TOM, AN INDIVIDUAL,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
INNOVATIVE HOME SYSTEMS, LLC,  
A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY,  
Respondent.

No. 65419

**FILED**

DEC 17 2014

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY S. Young  
DEPUTY CLERK

No. 66006

*ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME*


Appellant has filed a motion for a third extension of time to file the opening brief and has attached the proposed opening brief to the motion.<sup>1</sup> Having reviewed the motion, we grant it. We direct the clerk of this court to detach and file the proposed opening brief, attached as

---

<sup>1</sup>Appellant's counsel titled the motion as an "emergency" motion, apparently because she initially attempted to timely file the brief but it was rejected for non-compliance issues and when she sought to re-file the brief it was one day past the deadline. Motions treated as emergencies are governed by strict criteria set forth in NRAP 27(e), and appellant's counsel failed to comply with those requirements. A motion should not be deemed an emergency unless it meets the criteria set forth in (and counsel complies with) NRAP 27(e).

exhibit 6 to the motion.<sup>2</sup> Appellant failed, however, to submit any appendix with his opening brief. Appellant shall have three days from the date of this order to file and serve the appendix that he cites to in his opening brief. Thereafter, briefing shall proceed in accordance with NRAP 31(a)(1).

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

cc: Pezzillo Lloyd  
Snell & Wilmer, LLP/Las Vegas

---

<sup>2</sup>We remind counsel that, in the future, a document submitted for filing in this court shall be submitted as a separate document and should not be attached to the motion requesting filing of the document.