

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CASHMAN EQUIPMENT COMPANY, A
NEVADA CORPORATION,

Appellant,

vs.

WEST EDNA ASSOCIATES, LTD.,
D/B/A MOJAVE ELECTRIC, A NEVADA
CORPORATION; WESTERN SURETY
COMPANY, A SURETY; THE WHITING
TURNER CONTRACTING COMPANY,
A MARYLAND CORPORATION,

Respondents.

CASHMAN EQUIPMENT COMPANY, A
NEVADA CORPORATION,

Appellant,

vs.

WEST EDNA ASSOCIATES, LTD. D/B/A
MOJAVE ELECTRIC, A NEVADA
CORPORATION; WESTERN SURETY
COMPANY, A SURETY; THE WHITING
TURNER CONTRACTING COMPANY,
A MARYLAND CORPORATION; QH
LAS VEGAS LLC, A FOREIGN
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; PQ
LAS VEGAS, LLC, A FOREIGN
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; L W T
I C SUCCESSOR LLC, AN UNKNOWN
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; AND
FC/LW VEGAS, A FOREIGN LIMITED
LIABILITY COMPANY,

Respondents.

CASHMAN EQUIPMENT COMPANY, A
NEVADA CORPORATION,

Appellant,

vs.

WEST EDNA ASSOCIATES, LTD. D/B/A
MOJAVE ELECTRIC, A NEVADA
CORPORATION; WESTERN SURETY
COMPANY, A SURETY; THE WHITING

No. 61715

FILED

NOV 02 2015

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

No. 65819

No. 66452

TURNER CONTRACTING COMPANY,
A MARYLAND CORPORATION; QH
LAS VEGAS LLC, A FOREIGN
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; PQ
LAS VEGAS, LLC, A FOREIGN
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; L W T
I C SUCCESSOR LLC, AN UNKNOWN
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; AND
FC/LW VEGAS, A FOREIGN LIMITED
LIABILITY COMPANY,

Respondents.

ORDER DENYING MOTION

Appellant has filed a motion to strike respondents' answering brief on the ground that without having filed a notice of cross-appeal, respondents raise new arguments, issues and claims for relief that are not on appeal. Respondents have opposed the motion and appellant has filed a reply. Having considered the briefs and the arguments of the parties, we deny the motion. "A respondent may, however, without cross-appealing, advance any argument in support of the judgment even if the district court rejected or did not consider the argument." *Ford v. Showboat Operating Co.*, 110 Nev. 752, 755, 877 P.2d 546, 548 (1994). Appellants' objections to the answering brief are intertwined with the merits of the appeal. Accordingly, we deny the motion to strike.

It is so ORDERED.

 A.C.J.

cc: Howard & Howard Attorneys PLLC
Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine Wray Puzey & Thompson/Las Vegas