

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TRUDI LEE LYTLE; AND JOHN
ALLEN LYTLE, AS TRUSTEES OF THE
LYTLE TRUST,

Appellants,

vs.

SEPTEMBER TRUST, DATED MARCH
23, 1972; GERRY R. ZOBRIST; JOLIN G.
ZOBRIST, AS TRUSTEES OF THE
GERRY R. ZOBRIST AND JOLIN G.
ZOBRIST FAMILY TRUST; RAYNALDO
G. SANDOVAL; JULIE MARIE
SANDOVAL GEGEN, AS TRUSTEES
OF THE RAYNALDO G. AND EVELYN
A. SANDOVAL JOINT LIVING TRUST
AND DEVOLUTION TRUST DATED
MAY 27, 1992; DENNIS A. GEGEN;
AND JULIE S. GEGEN, HUSBAND
AND WIFE, AS JOINT TENANTS,

Respondents.

TRUDI LEE LYTLE; JOHN ALLEN
LYTLE; AND LYTLE TRUST,

Appellants,


vs.

SEPTEMBER TRUST, DATED MARCH
23, 1972; GERRY R. ZOBRIST; JOLIN G.
ZOBRIST, AS TRUSTEES OF THE
GERRY R. ZOBRIST AND JOLIN G.
ZOBRIST FAMILY TRUST; RAYNALDO
G. SANDOVAL; JULIE MARIE
SANDOVAL GEGEN, AS TRUSTEES
OF THE RAYNALDO G. AND EVELYN
A. SANDOVAL JOINT LIVING TRUST
AND DEVOLUTION TRUST DATED

No. 76198

FILED

AUG 26 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

No. 77007

19-35650

MAY 27, 1992; DENNIS A. GEGEN;
AND JULIE S. GEGEN, HUSBAND
AND WIFE, AS JOINT TENANTS,
Respondents.

ORDER GRANTING MOTION AND REJECTING REPLY BRIEF

Cause appearing, appellants' motion for leave to file a reply brief in excess of the type-volume limitation is granted. NRAP 32(a)(7)(A)(ii), (D). However, although the certificate included with the reply brief pursuant to NRAP 32(a)(9) indicates that the brief complies with the formatting requirements in NRAP 32(a)(4), review of the brief indicates that the margins are not at least 1 inch on all four sides as required by NRAP 32(a)(4).¹ Because the brief is not prepared in accordance with NRAP 32, the clerk of this court shall reject the reply brief filed on August 19, 2019. See NRAP 32(e) ("If a brief . . . is not prepared in accordance with this Rule, the clerk will not file the document, but shall return it to be properly prepared.").

Appellants shall have 7 days from the date of this order to file and serve a reply brief that complies with NRAP 32. Failure to file a timely reply brief may be treated as a waiver of the right to file a reply brief. NRAP 28(c).

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

¹Appellants' opening brief was rejected for this same reason on May 16, 2019.

cc: Gibbs Giden Locher Turner Senet & Wittbrodt LLP/Las Vegas
Christensen James & Martin