

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

WILLIAM POREMBA,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
SOUTHERN NEVADA PAVING; AND  
S&C CLAIMS SERVICES, INC.,  
Respondents.

No. 66888

**FILED**

JUL 17 2015

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

*ORDER GRANTING MOTION*

Appellant filed the opening brief and appendix on March 27, 2015. Accordingly, the answering brief was due to be filed by April 27, 2015. See NRAP 31(a)(1)(B). Respondents failed to timely file the answering brief and on June 9, 2015, we entered an order directing respondents to file the answering brief by June 22, 2015.

Respondents have now filed an untimely motion for an extension of time to file the answering brief. Counsel fails to explain why the motion, which does not comply with NRAP 31(b)(3)(A), is untimely. In support of the requested extension, counsel states only that additional time is necessary due to a change in counsel. However, respondents have not notified this court of any change in its counsel.

Counsel for respondents is admonished for failing to file a timely, properly supported motion for an extension of time. We caution counsel that future failure to comply with this court's procedural rules may result in the imposition of sanctions. Nevertheless, because it appears that an extension is necessary, we grant the motion. Respondent shall have until July 24, 2015, to file and serve the answering brief. No further extensions of time will be granted except upon demonstration of extraordinary circumstances and extreme need. NRAP 31(b)(3)(B).

Counsel's caseload normally will not be deemed such a circumstance. *Cf. Varnum v. Grady*, 90 Nev. 374, 528 P.2d 1027 (1974). Failure to timely file the answering brief may result in the imposition of sanctions. See NRAP 31(d).

It is so ORDERED.

1. J. J. J. J., C.J.

cc: Dunkley Law  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP/Las Vegas