

1 to consolidate these appeals on July 19, 2017. Appellant’s statements are vague and
2 lack any analysis or recitation to specific facts to support her argument.

3 The unquestionable reality is that the facts at issue here have changed
4 significantly since July 19, 2017. On July 19, 2017, the facts consisted of Appellant
5 having filed two appeals arising out of the same district court action below, neither of
6 which were resolved during a Court-ordered mediation held on July 13, 2017. In its
7 July 19, 2017 Order, the Court stated that “[t]hese appeals arise from the same district
8 court case **and involve the same parties.**” (emphasis added). However, on July 26,
9 2017, one week after consolidation of these appeals, the Court recognized that the
10 appeal in Docket Number 72965 probably does not involve the same parties. In its
11 July 26, 2017 Order, the Court noted that Appellant, ELIZABETH C. HOWARD,
12 may not be “aggrieved by the order imposing sanctions and thus lacks standing to
13 appeal it.” In fact, the person allegedly aggrieved by the order from which the appeal
14 in Docket Number 72965 was taken is counsel for Appellant, who is not a party to the
15 appeal in Docket Number 72685.

16 In addition to consolidating these appeals, the July 19, 2017 Order sets forth the
17 briefing schedule for the consolidated appeals and required Appellant to submit her
18 opening brief within ninety days, or by October 17, 2017. The July 26, 2017 Order
19 stayed the briefing indefinitely in the consolidated appeals.

20 We are now beyond the original deadline to file the opening brief despite
21 Appellant’s failure to timely comply with the July 26, 2017 Order and her filing of
22 multiple motions in which she seeks relief for her multiple failures to act in a timely
23 manner under the rules of appellate procedure. Every day by which the deadline to
24 file an opening brief is extended in Docket Number 72685, which does not concern
25 counsel for Appellant and is ripe for briefing and consideration, is another day in
26 which Appellant is allowed to enjoy the benefits of her ownership of the parties’
27 property to the exclusion of Respondent, who is justifiably concerned about waste and
28 depreciation of his interest in said property.

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRAP Rule 25(c), I hereby certify that I am an employee of ALLISON MacKENZIE, LTD., Attorneys at Law, and that on this date I caused the foregoing document to be served to all parties to this action by:

- Placing a true copy thereof in a sealed postage prepaid envelope, first class mail, in the United States Mail in Carson City, Nevada [NRAP 25(c)(1)(B)]
- Court's E-flex system
- Electronic Transmission

Via Court's E-flex System:

Charles R. Kozak, Esq.
R. Craig Luisani, Esq.

Via First Class Mail:

JONATHAN L. ANDREWS
SETTLEMENT JUDGE
14300 POLELINE ROAD
RENO, NV 89511

DATED this 23rd day of October, 2017.

/s/ Nancy Fontenot
NANCY FONTENOT