1	THORNDAL, ARMSTRONG, DELK,	
2	BALKENBUŚH & EISINGER Michael P. Lowry, Esq.	
3	Nevada Bar No. 10666 P.O. Drawer 2070	
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89125-2070 Tel: (702) 366-0622	Electronically Filed
5	Fax: (702) 366-0327	Nov 23 2015 12:30 p.m Tracie K. Lindeman
6	Email: mlowry@thorndal.com Attorneys for Glenn Welt, Rhoda Welt, Lynn Welt and Michele Welt	Clerk of Supreme Cour
7	IN THE SUPREME (COURT OF NEVADA
8	HOWARD SHAPIRO and JENNA SHAPIRO,	Supreme Ct. No. 67363 Dist. Ct. No. A-14-706566-C
9	Appellant/Cross-Respondent	MOTION TO STRIKE NEW
10	VS.	ARGUMENT FROM APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF IN 67363
11	GLEN WELT, RHODA WELT, LYNN	
12	WELT, and MICHELLE WELT,	
13	Respondent/Cross-Appellants.	
14	GLEN WELT, RHODA WELT, LYNN	Supreme Ct. No. 67596
15	WELT, and MICHELLE WELT,	Dist. Ct. No. A-14-706566-C
16	Appellant	
17	vs.	
18	HOWARD SHAPIRO and JENNA SHAPIRO,	
19	Respondent	
20		
21	Glenn Welt, Rhoda Welt, Lynn Welt	and Michelle Welt ("the Welts") request the
22	Court strike new argument from Howard and	I Jenna Shapiro's ("the Shapiros") opening
23	brief concerning docket 67363. The Shapiro	s argue for the first time on appeal that NRS
24	41.637(4) is unconstitutional. New argumen	ts are not permitted on appeal. This section
25	of the Shapiros' brief must be struck.	
26	///	
27	///	
28		1

1	DATED this 23 rd day of November, 2015.	
2	THORNDAL ARMSTRONG DELE BALKENBUSH & EISINGER	K
3		
4		
5	Michael P. Lowry, Esq. P.O. Drawer 2070 Las Vegas, NV 89125-2070	
6		elt,
7		
8	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES	
9	I. The Shapiros did not argue constitutionality to the district court.	
10	The Shapiros filed a complaint against the Welts. The Welts then succ	essfully
11	moved to dismiss per NRS 41.660 and the Shapiros appealed. On appeal, the	Shapiros
12	argue NRS 41.637(4) is unconstitutional. The Welts move to dismiss this new	v argument.
13	First, the Shapiros' appendix does not demonstrate they opposed the W	Velts'
14	motion by arguing NRS 41.637(4) was unconstitutional. Second, the Shapiro	s' appellate
15	docketing statement specifically asked three questions about whether a consti	tutional
16	issue is asserted. Constitutionality was not listed in response to question nine	asking for
17	statute of issues on appeal. Question eleven specifically asked if the Shapiro	s if their
18	appeal challenged the constitutionality of any statute. They answered no. ² In	stead they
19	responded the appeal concerned "an issue of statutory interpretation." Quest	ion twelve
20	also asked if the appeal concerned an "issue arising under the United States as	nd/or
21	Nevada Constitutions." The Shapiros again responded no. ⁴	
22	Parties may not raise new arguments for the first time on appeal. ⁵ The	Welts
23	request pages 4:1-13:7 be struck from the Shapiros' opening brief. The final	sentence to
24		
25		
26	11 4 200	
27	$\begin{bmatrix} Ia. \\ 5 \end{bmatrix}$ Pub. Emples. Benefits Program v. Las Vegas Metro. Police Dep't, 124 Nev. 138, 1	
28	P.3d 542, 550 (2008); Dermody v. City of Reno, 113 Nev. 207, 210-11, 931 P.2d 13 (1997).	<i>5</i> 4, 1 <i>5</i> 5 /

-2-

1	strike states, on page 13, "NRS 41.637(4) is in contravention of ancient common-law	
2	claims for defamation and are thus unconstitutionally vague as they create confusion	
3	concerning when a defamation case can be made and under what circumstances."	
4	DATED this 23 rd day of November, 2015.	
5	THORNDAL ARMSTRONG DELK BALKENBUSH & EISINGER	
6	/s/ Michael P. Lowry	
7	Michael P. Lowry, Esq. P.O. Drawer 2070	
8 9	Las Vegas, NV 89125-2070 Attorneys for Glenn Welt, Rhoda Welt,	
10	Lynn Welt and Michele Welt	
11		
12	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
13	Pursuant to NRAP 25, on November 23, 2015 the MOTION TO STRIKE NEW	
14	ARGUMENT FROM APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF IN 67363 was served upo	
15	each of the parties to appeal 67363 via electronic service through the Supreme Court of	
16	Nevada's electronic filing.	
17		
18	/s/ Michael P. Lowry	
19	An Employee of Thorndal, Armstrong, Delk, Balkenbush & Eisinger	
20	Daixenousii & Lisnigei	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		