IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2

1

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

THERESA GARCIA TREJO,

Appellant,,

Respondent.

3

4

5

v.

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

Supreme Court Case No. 67843 Electronically Filed District Court Case 050201611240059-10. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING RESPONDENT'S ANSWERING BRIEF

Pursuant to NRAP 26(b) and 31(b)(3), Respondent Theresa Garcia Trejo requests a 14-day extension of time, up to and including January 25, 2016, in which to file her answering brief. The parties previously stipulated to one 30-day extension, which extended the original deadline to the current deadline of January Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is the declaration of counsel for 11, 2016. Respondent, David N. Frederick, Esq., setting forth why the extension is needed. Counsel for Appellant has no opposition to this requested extension. *Id.* at \P 8. Based on the declaration of Mr. Frederick, good cause exists for the requested 14-

1	day extension, and Respondent respectfully requests the Court grant the 14-day
2	extension.
3	Dated this 5 th day of January 2016.
4	Maupin • Naylor • Braster
5	A. William Maupin (NBN 1315) John M. Naylor (NBN 5435) Jennifer L. Braster (NBN 9982)
6	Jennifer L. Braster (NBN 9982) NETTLES LAW FIRM
7	Brian D. Nettles (NBN 3660)
8	William R. Killip, Jr. (NBN 7462) GARCIA OCHOA MASK
9	Ricardo A. Garcia (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)
10	Jody R. Mask (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) LAWRENCE LAW FIRM
11	LAWRENCE LAW FIRM Larry Wayne Lawrence (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)
12	DAVID N. FREDERICK (NBN 1548)
	Dru/o/ A. William Maunin
13	By: <u>/s/ A. William Maupin</u> A. William Maupin
14	Maupin • Naylor • Braster
15	1050 Indigo Drive, Suite 112
16	Las Vegas, NV 89145
17	Attorneys for Respondent Theresa Garcia
18	Trejo
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	I hereby certify that I am an employee of Maupin • Naylor • Braster and that
3	on the 5 th day of January 2016, I electronically filed and served a true and correct
4	copy of the above and foregoing UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION
5	OF TIME FOR FILING RESPONDENT'S ANSWERING BRIEF to be served
6	as follows:
7	[X] by depositing same for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed
8	envelope addressed to:
9 10 11 12	Lisa Perrochet Emily V. Cuatto Horvitz & Levy LLP 15760 Ventura Blvd., 18 th Floor Encino, CA 91436 Attorneys for Appellant Ford Motor Company
13 14 15	Michael W. Eady Thompson Coe Cousins & Irons, LLP 701 Brazos Street, 15 th Floor Austin, TX 78701 Attorneys for Appellant Ford Motor Company
16 17 18	Ricardo A. Garcia Jody R. Mask Garcia Ochoa Mask 820 South Main Street McAllen, TX 78501 Attorneys for Respondent Theresa Garcia Trejo
19 20 21	Larry W. Lawrence, Jr. Lawrence Law Firm 3112 Windsor Road, Suite A234 Austin, TX 78703 Attorneys for Respondent Theresa Garcia Trejo
22 23 24	[X] by the Court's CM/ECF system which will send notification to the following:
	Vaughn A. Crawford
25 26	Jay J. Schuttert Morgan T. Petrelli Snell & Wilmon J. D
26 27	Snell & Wilmer LLP 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100 Las Vegas, NV 89169 Attorneys for Appellant Ford Motor Company
28	1 7

1	
2	Brian D. Nettles William R. Killip, Jr. Nettles Law Firm
3	Nettles Law Firm 1389 Galleria Drive, Suite 200 Henderson, NV 89014
4	Henderson, NV 89014 Attorneys for Respondent Theresa Garcia Trejo
5	David N. Frederick 43 Innisbrook Avenue
6	Las Vegas, NV 89113 Attorneys for Respondent Theresa Garcia Trejo
7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
8	Beau Sterling Sterling Law, LLC 228 South 4 th Street, 1 st Floor Las Vegas, NV 89101 Attorneys for Respondent Theresa Garcia Trejo
10	Attorneys for Respondent Theresa Garcia Trejo
11	
12	/s/ Amy Reams An Employee of MAUPIN • NAYLOR • BRASTER
13	An Employee of MAUPIN • NAYLOR • BRASTER
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

DECLARATION OF DAVID N. FREDERICK

- 1. I am David N. Frederick, Esq., and I am an attorney of record for Respondent Theresa Garcia Trejo ("Respondent") in the matter of *Ford Motor Company v. Trejo*, Case No. 67843, on appeal before the Nevada Supreme Court. This declaration is based on my personal knowledge.
- 2. This declaration is made in support of Respondent's Motion for Extension of Time for Filing Respondent's Answering Brief ("Motion to Extend") seeking an extension until January 25, 2016.
- 3. The due date for this brief has been extended once, for a period of thirty days, by stipulation of the parties. Currently, Respondent's Answering Brief is due on January 11, 2016.
- 4. I am the attorney principally responsible for researching and drafting Respondent's Answering Brief.
- 5. This is an appeal from a judgment on a jury verdict in a wrongful death products liability action involving a great deal of highly intensive expert witness testimony.
- 6. In addition, Appellant Ford Motor Company and its *Amici Curiae*, the National Association of Manufacturers and the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, seek a major change in Nevada products liability law that is highly controversial and which has been the subject of quite a number of law review articles and which has received a wide variety of responses from courts around the country when this and related issues have been presented to them.
- 7. I have been diligently engaged in the research and drafting of Respondent's Answering Brief and portions of that brief have been and are in the process of being drafted. However, the holidays and other personal and family matters extending into the New Year have and will prevent additional research and the completion of review, revision, and approval of the brief in time for filing by

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

the present due date, January 11, 2016. I presently believe that it will be possible to complete research, preparation, review, revision, and approval of the brief in time for filing by the new due date sought in this motion, January 25, 2016.

- 8. Counsel for Appellant has no opposition to this requested extension until January 25, 2016.
- 9. This extension is not sought for purposes of delay and solely because, in my opinion, as an officer of the Court, the extension sought is necessary to fully and properly brief the Court on the issues presented in this appeal.
 - 10. I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct. Dated this <u>5th</u> of January 2016.

<u>/s/ David N. Frederick</u> DAVID N. FREDERICK