## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TONY LEE HOBSON,

Appellant,

vs. THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

No. 71419

FILED

AUG 16 2017

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY DEPUTY CLERK

## ORDER DENYING MOTION

Respondent has filed a motion for a second extension of time (60 days) to file the answering brief. Respondent's motion is nearly identical to the previous motion and counsel offers the same reasons proffered in support of the previous motion (lengthy appendix and issues involving detailed factual and legal inquiries). Respondent fails to demonstrate extraordinary circumstances and extreme need warranting a second 60-day extension of time. See NRAP 31(b)(3)(B). Accordingly, the motion is denied.

Respondent shall have until August 25, 2017, to file and serve the answering brief. No further extensions of time shall be permitted absent extraordinary circumstances and extreme need. *Id.* Counsel's caseload normally will not be deemed such a circumstance. *Cf. Varnum v. Grady*, 90 Nev. 374, 528 P.2d 1027 (1974). Failure to timely file the answering brief may result in the imposition of sanctions. *See* NRAP 31(d).

It is so ORDERED.

Cherry, C.J.

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A .

cc: Sandra L. Stewart
Attorney General/Carson City
Clark County District Attorney

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

