1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA		
2	PAT SONGER	Case No. 67414	
3	Appellant,	Electronically File Apr 08 2016 08:3	
4	v.	Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme	an
5	RAYMOND DELUCCHI and TOMMY HOLLIS,	ARGUMENTS AND CONSOLIDATE WITH	
6	Respondents.	NEVADA SUPREME COURT DOCKET NO. 68994	
7		<u> </u>	
8	COMES NOW Respondents Raymond Delucchi and Tommy Hollis, by and		
9	through undersigned counsel Adam Levine, Esq., of the Law Office of Daniel		
10	Marks and hereby moves the Court to Vacate Oral Arguments and Consolidate		
11	with Nevada Supreme Court Docket No. 68994. The grounds for Respondents'		
12	Motion are set forth in the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities.		
13	DATED this day of April, 2016.		
14	LAW OFFI	CE OF DANIEL MARKS	
15	AC/		
16	DANIEL MARKS, ESQ.		
17	Nevada State Bar No. 002003 ADAM LEVINE, ESQ.		
18	Nevada State Bar No. 004673 610 South Ninth Street		
19	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 386/0536: Fax (702) 386-6812		
20	Attorneys fo	or Respondents	

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

On April 1, 2016 this Court issued a Notice of Oral Argument Setting which set oral argument for May 10, 2016. The issue before the Court in this appeal is whether the district court abused its discretion in the amount of attorney's fees awarded to Appellant pursuant to a Special Motion to Dismiss filed under Nevada's Anti-SLAPP statutes. See NRS 41.670.

However, the appeal over whether that Special Motion to Dismiss should have been granted in the first instance is currently pending before the Court in Docket No. 68994, and has not yet even been briefed due to the fact that the original appeal on this issue was dismissed on ripeness grounds in Docket No. 66858. It was only on March 30, 2016 that this Court reinstated the briefing schedule in Docket No. 68994 after denying a Motion to Dismiss.

A review of the Docketing Statement filed in connection with this appeal will reveal that the basis for the court's appellate jurisdiction is that the award of fees constitutes a "special order entered after final judgment" pursuant to NRAP 3(A)(8). If the Court reverses the final judgment in connection with the appeal in Docket No. 68994, it will not need to decide whether the amount of attorney's fees was inadequate in connection with this appeal.

This Court's resources are "valuable and limited". Pan v. Eighth Judicial District Court, 120 Nev. 222, 229, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004). Holding oral

argument on the *amount* of fees awarded, prior to deciding the underlying case as to *whether* the Special Motion to Dismiss should have been granted in the first place, is not the best use of those valuable and limited judicial resources.

For all of the reasons set forth above, Respondents request that the Oral Argument be vacated and this appeal consolidated with Docket No. 68994.

DATED this _____ day of April, 2016.

LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL MARKS

DANIEL MARKS, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 002003
ADAM LEVINE, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 004673
610 South Ninth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 386-0536; Fax (702) 386-6812
Attorneys for Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I certify that on the day of April, 2016, I served a copy of this completed Motion to Vacate Oral Argument and Consolidate with Nevada Supreme Court Docket No. 68994 upon all counsel of record: ☐ By personally serving it upon him/her; or ☐ By mailing it by first class mail with sufficient postage prepaid to the following address(es): ■ By serving it upon him/her via electronic filing as mandated by the Court to the email address as provided to the Court by opposing counsel. Dated this _____ day of April, 2016.