## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION. A NEVADA NON-PROFIT CORPORATION. Petitioner, vs. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK: AND THE HONORABLE SUSAN JOHNSON, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents. and D.R. HORTON, INC., Real Party in Interest. D.R. HORTON, INC., A DELAWARE CORPORATION. Petitioner, VS. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE ALLAN R. EARL, DISTRICT JUDGE, Respondents, and FIRST LIGHT HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, A NEVADA NON-PROFIT CORPORATION, FOR ITSELF AND FOR ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED. Real Party in Interest.

HIGH NOON AT ARLINGTON RANCH

No. 65456 FILED DEC 102014 TRACIE K. LINDEMAN CLERIK OF SUPREME COURT BY DEPUTY CLERK No. 65993

ORDER CONSOLIDATING CASES FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

After oral argument was scheduled in Docket No. 65456, D.R. Horton, Inc., filed motions to consolidate Docket No. 65993 with Docket No. 65456 for purposes of oral argument. Having considered the motions,

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA as well as all responses filed with respect thereto, the motions are granted to the following extent. These cases are consolidated for purposes of oral argument. Oral argument will be held before the en banc court on January 7, 2015, at 10 a.m. in Carson City; each side will be allowed 20 minutes for argument.<sup>1</sup>

It is so ORDERED.<sup>2</sup>

1 Jardestry\_\_\_\_ A.C.J.

Angius & Terry LLP/Las Vegas
Wood, Smith, Henning & Berman, LLP/Las Vegas
Wolfenzon Rolle/Las Vegas
James R. Christensen
Maddox, Isaacson & Cisneros, LLP
Canepa Riedy Abele & Castello

<sup>1</sup>Counsel for each side shall coordinate among themselves how their time is to be allocated.

<sup>2</sup>In their "notice of non-opposition" to the motion to consolidate, High Noon at Arlington Ranch Homeowners Association "reserve[d] its right to object to the law firm of Wolfenzon Rolle" participating in oral argument due to a "recently discovered... conflict," which Wolfenzon Rolle argues in response is nonexistent. At this time, we decline to take any action with respect to the alleged conflict. If a party believes there is a meritorious basis for disqualifying any attorney in this matter, that party should file a properly supported written motion as far in advance of the oral argument date as possible.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA