IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL,
Appellant,

VS.

Electronically Filed Dec 17 2018 03:20 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

CITY OF HENDERSON, Respondent.

Case No. 73287

DC Case No. A-16-747289-W

APPELLANT'S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CONTINUE ORAL ARGUMENT

Appellant the Las Vegas Review-Journal ("Review-Journal"), by and through its counsel of record, Margaret A. McLetchie of McLetchie Law, hereby moves this Court for an order continuing the oral argument in the above-entitled matter.

Oral argument is currently scheduled for January 8, 2019. A continuance is necessary because counsel for the Review-Journal also has oral argument scheduled for January 8, 2019 on an Emergency Petition for Writ of Prohibition filed in *Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, Case No. 76848. The Review-Journal is the real party in interest in that matter. Because the Emergency Petition for Writ of Prohibition involves complex legal issues, undersigned counsel will need a substantial amount of time to prepare for argument in that matter. Additionally, the undersigned counsel has an Answering Brief due on January 7, 2019 in *Abrams, et al. v. Louis Schneider, et al.*, Nev. S. Ct. Case No.

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

This Court has the inherent authority to manage its docket and continue hearings upon a party's motion to the Court. Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 34(a) provides that "[a] motion to postpone the argument must be filed reasonably in advance of the date fixed for hearing. On December 4, 2018, the Court filed a notice scheduling oral argument for January 8, 2019. Thus, the instant motion is being made "reasonably in advance of the date fixed for hearing."

As discussed above, undersigned counsel has obligations in other matters before this Court which materially affect her ability to prepare for oral argument in this case. Specifically, counsel has another oral argument scheduled for January 8, 2019 in *Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, Case No. 76848. Additionally, counsel has an Answering Brief due on January 7, 2019 in *Abrams, et al. v. Louis Schneider, et al.*, Nev. S. Ct. Case No. 73838. Thus, good cause exists to continue oral argument in this matter.

On December 14 and 17, 2018, counsel for the Review-Journal communicated with Dennis Kennedy, counsel for the City of Henderson in this matter, to notify him of the need to continue oral argument. On December 17, 2018, Mr. Kennedy

¹ Further, undersigned counsel will be out of the jurisdiction December 22, 2018 through December 29, 2018 with family for the holidays.

indicated the City of Henderson did not oppose continuing oral argument. The undersigned appreciates the City of Henderson's and counsel's professional courtesy.

CONCLUSION

Based on the reasons set forth above, the Review-Journal respectfully moves this Court for an order continuing oral argument to a later date.

/s/ Margaret A. McLetchie

Margaret A. McLetchie, Nevada Bar No. 10931 Alina M. Shell, Nevada Bar No. 11711 MCLETCHIE LAW 701 East Bridger Ave., Suite 520 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 728-5300

Fax: (702) 425-8220

Counsel for Appellant, Las Vegas Review-Journal

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of McLetchie Law and that on this 17th day of December, 2018 the APPELLANT'S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CONTINUE ORAL ARGUMENT 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:

Josh M. Reid, Brandon P. Kemble, and Brian R. Reeve CITY OF HENDERSON'S ATTORNEY OFFICE 240 Water Street, MSC 144 Henderson, NV 89015

Dennis L. Kennedy, Sarah P. Harmon, and Kelly B. Stout **BAILEY KENNEDY** 8984 Spanish Ridge Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89148

Counsel for Respondent City of Henderson

/s/ Pharan Burchfield
Employee, McLetchie Law