

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAPONICA GLOVER-ARMONT,
Appellant,
vs.
JOHN CARGILE; AND CITY OF
NORTH LAS VEGAS, A MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION EXISTING UNDER
THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF
NEVADA IN THE COUNTY OF CLARK,
Respondents.

No. 70988

FILED

MAY 09 2017

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER DENYING MOTION

The parties have filed a stipulation for a third extension of time to file the opening brief. We elect to treat the stipulation as a joint motion for an extension of time. *See* NRAP 31(b)(2) (parties may stipulate to one 30-day extension of time from the due date established by the rule).

When we granted appellant's previous motion for an extension of time, we explained that no further extensions would be permitted absent demonstration of extraordinary circumstances and extreme need. *See* NRAP 31(b)(3)(B). In support of the current motion, counsel for appellant states that this appeal involves important legal issues and she needs more time to prepare the brief. In the absence of more explanation, we conclude appellant fails to demonstrate extraordinary circumstances and extreme need warranting an additional extension of time. Accordingly, the motion is denied. Appellant shall have 11 days from the date of this order to file and serve the opening brief and appendix. No further extensions of time shall be permitted absent demonstration of extreme and unforeseeable circumstances. Counsel's caseload will not be deemed such a circumstance. *Cf. Varnum v. Grady*, 90 Nev. 374, 528 P.2d

1027 (1974). Failure to comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions. NRAP 31(d).

It is so ORDERED.

Cherry, C.J.

cc: Ganz & Hauf/Las Vegas
North Las Vegas City Attorney