IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * * *

HONORABLE CATHERINE RAMSEY
NORTH LAS VEGAS MUNICIPAL
JUDGE,

Appellant,

vs.

THE CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS;
BARBARA A. ANDOLINA, CITY CLERK
OF NORTH LAS VEGAS; BETTY
HAMILTON; MICHAEL WILLIAM
MORENO; AND BOB BORGENSEN,
INDIVIDUALLY AND AS MEMBERS
OF "REMOVE RAMSEY NOW",

Respondents.
_____/

No. 68450

MOTION FOR SEVEN-DAY EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF AND ACCOMPANYING MOTION

Pursuant to NRAP 29(f), the Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction (NJLJ) hereby request a seven-day extension of time for filing its proposed amicus curiae brief, which will be accompanied by a motion seeking leave to file the brief. The proposed brief will be submitted in support of the position of appellant. The NJLJ is an association of Justice Court and Municipal Court judges from throughout Nevada. The NJLJ is interested in expressing its position regarding the constitutional issue presented in this appeal.

This is an unusual case in which the appellant, who is a Municipal Court judge, filed a writ petition in docket Number 68394. This court issued an order to show cause regarding jurisdiction, and the judge responded. In the meantime, she filed a notice of appeal, which was docketed separately as Number 68450.

On July 27, 2015, this court entered an order denying the petition in Number 68394, on the ground that the appeal provided the judge with an adequate remedy at law. This court treated the writ petition as the opening brief in the present appeal docket, and the court ordered the clerk to transfer the dockets in Number 68394 to Number 68450. Consequently, there will be no separate opening brief in Number 68450.

This unusual situation creates uncertainty as to when a proposed amicus brief is due. Pursuant to NRAP 29(f), an amicus brief must be filed with the accompanying motion not later than seven days after filing of the brief of the party being supported. In this case the previously-filed writ petition has now been deemed to be the opening brief. The undersigned counsel assumes that the opening brief will be deemed filed on the date of this court's recent order, i.e., July 27, 2015. If this assumption is correct, the proposed amicus brief and accompanying motion are due on August 5, 2015.

The undersigned counsel for the NJLJ was out of town for three days during this time frame. Counsel for the NJLJ did not learn of this court's July 27, 2015 order until the afternoon of August 4, 2015. Counsel is working on the proposed amicus brief, but it cannot be finished before the deadline. An additional week is needed for the brief.

NRAP 29(f) allows the court to grant leave for later filing of an amicus brief. Accordingly, the NJLJ hereby requests additional time, until August 12, 2015, for filing the proposed amicus brief and its accompanying motion for leave to file the brief.

DATED: Aug. 4, 2015

ROBERT L. EISENBERG (Bar #0950)
Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg
6005 Plumas Street, Third Floor
Reno, Nevada 89519
775-786-6868
rle@lge.net

ATTORNEYS FOR NEVADA JUDGES OF LIMITED JURISDICTION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg and that on this date the foregoing was filed electronically with the Clerk of the Nevada Supreme Court, and therefore electronic service was made in accordance with the master service list as follows:

Dominic Gentile
Richard Gordon
Colleen McCarty
Craig Mueller
Daniel Ivie
Patrick Byrne

I further certify that on this date I served copies of this Motion, postage prepaid, by U.S. mail to:

Steven Goldstein
Mueller Hinds & Associates
600 S. Eighth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Ross Miller
Nevada Secretary of State
101 N. Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

DATED: 8/4/15