IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

VEGAS UNITED INVESTMENT SERIES 105, INC., a Nevada Domestic Corporation

Appellant,

v.

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

CELTIC BANK CORPORATION, Successor-in-Interest to SILVER STATE BANK by acquisition of assets from the FDIC as Receiver for SILVER STATE BANK, a Utah Banking Corporation organized and in good standing with the laws of the State of Utah,

Respondent.

Electronically Filed
Supreme Court No. 74163 2018 03:20 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
District Court Case No. 2823 preme Court

RESPONSE TO MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE OPENING BRIEF AND APPENDIX (Second Request)

Respondent, CELTIC BANK CORPORATION, ("Respondent"), by and through its attorney, Allyson R. Noto, Esq. of the law firm of Sylvester & Polednak, Ltd., respectfully submits this Response to Motion to Extend Time to File Opening Brief and Appendix (Second Request).

I. INTRODUCTION

This case arises from Respondent's exercise of its rights pursuant to its first priority Deed of Trust recorded against a <u>commercial</u> property located at 181 N.

1

Gibson Road, Henderson, Nevada (the "Property"). Appellant purchased the Property for \$30,000 at an Owner's Association foreclosure sale ("Association Sale").

After trial, the trial court found in favor of Respondent and ordered that Respondent could judicially foreclose upon the Property.

The trial court then denied Appellant's request for injunction finding that Appellant failed to meet its burden regarding the requisite elements to obtain an injunction pending appeal.

The trial court based its decision, in part, due to Appellant's continued lack of interest in protecting the Property from third-party claims. The trial court considered all the factors enumerated in *Mikohn Gaming Corp. v. McCrea*, 120 Nev. 248 (2004)(citing *Fritz Hansen A/S v. District Court*, 116 Nev. 650, 659 (2000)). The trial court was concerned about the irreparable harm to the Respondent if Appellant's stay is granted. Further, the trial court found that Appellant did not enjoy a likelihood of success on the merits. Thus, two of the factors weighed heavily in favor of Respondent and the injunction was denied.

II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

This appeal has been pending since September 28, 2017. The following is the pertinent timeline of events:

1	Timeline of Events:
2 3	09.05.17 - Notice of Entry of Finding of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and
4	Judgment Entered by trial court
5	09.28.17 – Notice of Appeal
6 7	11.06.17 – Notice of Amended Appeal
8	11.08.17 – Motion for Injunction Pending Appeal on OST filed in lower court
9	11.21.17 – Notice of Entry of Order Denying Motion for Injunction Pending
10	Appeal on OST Entered
12	11.21.17 – Foreclosure Sale
13 14	02.23.18 – Court Issued Order to Show Cause re: Jurisdiction
15	03.26.18 – Appellant's Response to Court Issued Order to Show Cause re:
16	Jurisdiction
17 18	05.10.18 – Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Certify Judgment
19	05.29.18 – Order Reinstating Briefing
20 21	08.28.18 – Motion to Extend Time to File Brief and Appendix – First Request
22	09.06.18 – Order Granting Motion to Extend Time to File Brief and Appendix –
23	First Request
24 25	10.11.18 - Motion to Extend Time to File Brief and Appendix – Second Request
26	
27	
28	3

In Appellant's second Motion to Extend Time to File Opening Brief and Appendix, Appellant concedes that it first was required by this Court to show cause regarding a potential jurisdictional defect which delayed the appeal. Next, Appellant argues that "personal and professional obligations" precluded its initial ability to comport with the timeline provided by this Court for its Opening Brief. Appellant correctly advises that this Court cautioned when it extended Appellant's time for its Opening Brief that additional extensions would not be granted "absent extraordinary circumstances." Now the Appellant comes to this Court and requests yet another extension due to an "inadvertent error" which resulted in the trial transcript not being timely completed. It is unfathomable that Appellant did not confirm the receipt of the transcript when its original briefing was required or at least in the six months since this Court reinstated the briefing following the It cannot be said that this is the type of "extraordinary Order to Show Cause. circumstances" that would provide this Court the basis for extending the time period yet again.

Appellant erroneously argues that further extension would not "significantly adversely affect the instant appeal." However, this case involves title to real property. The delays in the Appeal directly impact the Respondent's rights as it relates to the real property. Respondent prevailed on a judicial

foreclosure action in the court below and has foreclosed on the subject property. There is a one year right of redemption period following the judicial foreclosure which expires on November 21, 2018. Further delay results in uncertainty related to the Respondent's rights and interests in the property and causes Respondent to incur fees and costs related to taxes, insurance, and the ability to sell the real property following the expiration of the right of redemption. It is respectfully submitted that the prejudice to the Respondent in granting a further extension of time is substantial.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this Court deny Appellant's request for further extension and allow this Appeal to proceed in order for Respondent to obtain finality regarding title to the real property.

DATED this 11th day of October, 2018.

SYLVESTER & PQLEDNAK, LTD.

By

Allyson R/Noto, Esq.

1731 Village Center Circle

Las Vegas, NV 89134

Attorneys for Respondent