

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JEFFREY BENKO, A NEVADA
RESIDENT; CAMILO MARTINEZ, A
NEVADA RESIDENT; ANA MARTINEZ,
A NEVADA RESIDENT; FRANK
SCINTA, A NEVADA RESIDENT;
JACQUELINE SCINTA, A NEVADA
RESIDENT; SUSAN HJORTH, A
NEVADA RESIDENT; RAYMOND
SANSOTA, A OHIO RESIDENT;
FRANCINE SANSOTA, A OHIO
RESIDENT; SANDRA KUHN, A
NEVADA RESIDENT; JESUS GOMEZ,
A NEVADA RESIDENT; SILVIA
GOMEZ, A NEVADA RESIDENT;
DONNA HERRERA, A NEVADA
RESIDENT; JESSE HENNIGAN, A
NEVADA RESIDENT; SUSAN
KALLEN, A NEVADA RESIDENT;
ROBERT MANDARICH, A NEVADA
RESIDENT; JAMES NICO, A NEVADA
RESIDENT; PATRICIA
TAGLIAMONTE, A NEVADA
RESIDENT; AND BIJAN LAGHAEI,
Appellants,

vs.

QUALITY LOAN SERVICE
CORPORATION, A CALIFORNIA
CORPORATION; MTC FINANCIAL
INC., D/B/A TRUSTEE CORPS, A
CALIFORNIA CORPORATION;
MERIDIAN FORECLOSURE SERVICE,
A CALIFORNIA AND NEVADA
CORPORATION, D/B/A MTDS, INC.,
D/B/A MERIDIAN TRUST DEED
SERVICE; NATIONAL DEFAULT
SERVICING CORPORATION, A
ARIZONA CORPORATION; AND
CALIFORNIA RECONVEYANCE

No. 73484

FILED

MAR 05 2018

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

COMPANY, A CALIFORNIA
CORPORATION,
Respondents.

ORDER DENYING MOTION

Appellants have filed a motion for leave to file an opening brief in excess of the type-volume limitation. *See* NRAP 32(a)(7)(D). Appellants seek permission to file an opening brief of 26,738 words, almost twice the limit of 14,000 set by NRAP 32(a)(7)(A)(ii). In support of the motion, counsel for appellants explains the space is needed because of the complex procedural history in this putative class action.

This court "looks with disfavor on motions to exceed the applicable page limit or type-volume limitation, and therefore, permission to exceed the page limit or type-volume limitation will not be routinely granted." NRAP 32(a)(7)(D)(i); *see also Hernandez v. State*, 117 Nev. 463, 467, 24 P.3d 767, 770 (2001) ("Page limits . . . are ordinary practices employed by the courts to assist in the efficient management of the cases before them." (*quoting Cunningham v. Becker*, 96 F. Supp. 2d 369, 374 (D. Del. 2000))). Rather, a motion "will be granted only upon a showing of diligence and good cause." NRAP 32(a)(7)(D)(i). We are not convinced that an opening brief in excess of the usual type-volume limitation is warranted in this case. Accordingly, the motion is denied.

The clerk of this court shall return, unfiled, the opening brief received on February 28, 2018. Appellants shall have 15 days from the date of this order to file and serve an opening brief that complies with the page

or type-volume limitation set forth in NRAP 32(a)(7)(A). Failure to timely comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions. NRAP 31(d).

It is so ORDERED.


_____, C.J.

cc: Law Offices of Nicholas A. Boylan, APC
Christopher Legal Group
Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP
Tiffany & Bosco, P. A.
Bryan Cave LLP/Phoenix
Smith Larsen & Wixom
McCarthy & Holthus, LLP/Las Vegas
Kolesar & Leatham, Chtd.