



SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
ELIZABETH A. BROWN, CLERK
201 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 201
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701-4702

Telephone
(775) 684-1600

September 29, 2017

Eleanor Ahern
355 W. Mesquite Blvd., Ste. D30
Mesquite, NV 89027

Re: In Re: Connell Living Trust, Supreme Court Case No. 66231/67782/68046

Dear Ms. Ahern:

Because you are represented by counsel in this appeal, and the filing fee for the rehearing was not paid, your petition for rehearing received on May 24, 2017 is being returned to you, unfiled.

Sincerely,

R. Wunsch
Deputy Clerk

17-33264

CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
2017 MAY 22 PM 3:14

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA **RETURNED UNFILED**

IN THE MATTER OF: THE W.N.
CONNELL AND MARJORIE T.
CONNELL LIVING TRUST, DATED
MAY 18, 1972.

Supreme Court No 66231 SEP 29 2017
District Court Case No. ELIZABETH A. BROWN
P-09-066425-T CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

Appeal from the Eighth
District Court, The Honorable
Gloria Sturman Presiding

ELEANOR C. AHERN A/K/A
ELEANOR CONNELL HARTMAN
AHERN,

Appellant,

vs.

JACQUELINE M. MONTOYA; AND
KATHRYN A. BOUVIER,

Respondents.

~~PROPER PERSON
RECEIVED/ENTERED
MAY 25 2017
ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT~~

IN THE MATTER OF THE W.N.
CONNELL AND MARJORIE T.
CONNELL LIVING TRUST, DATED
MAY 18, 1972, AN INTER VIVOS
IRREVOCABLE TRUST

Consolidated with:
Supreme Court No.: 67782

ELEANOR CONNELL HARTMAN
AHERN,

Appellant,

vs.

KATHRYN A. BOUVIER; AND
JACQUELINE M. MONTOYA,

Respondents.

THE MATTER OF THE W. N.
CONNELL AND MARJORIE T.
CONNELL LIVING TRUST, DATED
MAY 18, 1972, AN INTER VIVOS

Consolidated with:
Supreme Court No.: 68046

RECEIVED
MAY 24 2017
ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERK

IRREVOCABLE TRUST

ELEANOR CONNELL HARTMAN
AHERN,

Appellant,

vs.

JACQUELINE M. MONTOYA; AND
KATHRYN A. BOUVIER,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner, Eleanor Connell Hartman Ahern, Pro Se, petitions this Court for rehearing of its opinion entered in this proceeding on May 4, 2017.

This petition is made pursuant to NRAP 40 on the ground that the court has overlooked or misapprehended material points of law or fact requiring rehearing. This petition is supported by the following points and authorities and based upon all pleading, documents and exhibits on file herein.

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

1. First and foremost, the Respondents/Daughters¹ were not entitled to summary judgment on the merits. In their Answering Brief, the Daughters

¹ Respondents Jacqueline Montoya and Kathryn Bouvier (“Respondents” or “Daughters”)