IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * * * *

SATICOY BAY LLC SERIES 9641 CHRISTINE VIEW,

No. 69419

Electronically Filed Sep 28 2017 12:35 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Appellant,

v.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION,

Respondent.

RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL TIME FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Respondent Federal National Mortgage Association ("Fannie Mae") respectfully takes no position on appellant's motion to enlarge the time for oral argument. While Fannie Mae does not believe that more than 15 minutes of argument per side is necessary to address the issues presented in this appeal—and Saticoy Bay offers no substantive explanation why it would be—Fannie Mae will of course be prepared to participate in an argument of whatever duration the Court would find useful.

That said, Fannie Mae respectfully requests that, regardless of how the Court rules on appellant's motion, the argument remain calendared for the presently-scheduled date, November 6, 2017, because Fannie Mae's primary interest is in bringing this appeal to resolution as efficiently and expeditiously as possible. Fannie

Mae respectfully submits that the Court's decision to hear this appeal *en banc* reflects the importance of the guidance its decision will provide to district courts, before which hundreds of actions presenting similar issues remain pending. Those actions have, in many instances, been percolating for years, and at this point their expeditious resolution is becoming an increasingly urgent priority. The recent request of *amicus curiae* the Federal Housing Finance Agency to participate in oral argument—a request to which Fannie Mae unreservedly consents—highlights the importance of bringing this appeal to resolution promptly, and underscores the significance of the guidance this Court's decision will provide.

If accommodating appellant's request for a longer oral argument were to require moving the argument to a later date, that would likely delay resolution of this appeal, which in turn would deprive the district courts (and parties before them) of the important guidance a decision will provide, at least for a time. Moreover, Fannie Mae and its counsel (and, presumably, Saticoy Bay and its counsel) have already arranged their schedules to be available November 6; rescheduling the argument could therefore lead to cumbersome calendar issues. Indeed, in reliance on the November 6 date, the undersigned counsel has already rescheduled a personal travel commitment that involves several other people.

Therefore, regardless of how the Court rules on appellant's motion, Fannie Mae respectfully urges the Court to maintain the current argument date of November 6, 2017.

DATED: 4pt. 28, 2017

ROBERT L. EISENBERG (Bar # 0950)

Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg 6005 Plumas Street, Third Floor

Reno, Nevada 89509 775-786-6868

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

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:

Michael F. Bohn:

mbohn@bohnlawfirm.com

Attorney for Appellant

Laurel I. Handley:

lhandley@aldridgepite.com

Jory C. Garabedian: <u>igarabedian@aldridgepite.com</u>

Attorneys for Respondent

Leslie Bryan Hart: lhart@fclaw.com

John Tennert:

jtennert@fclaw.com

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Federal Housing Finance Agency

I further certify that a copy of the foregoing was sent via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to:

Howard N. Cayne

Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP

601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20001

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Federal Housing Finance Agency

Vicki Shapiro, Assistant to Robert L. Eisenberg