

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JUDY PALMIERI,

Appellant,

vs.

CLARK COUNTY, A POLITICAL  
SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF  
NEVADA; AND DAWN STOCKMAN,  
CEO96, INDIVIDUALLY AND IN HER  
OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS AN OFFICER  
EMPLOYED BY THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK,  
Respondents.

No. 65143

**FILED**

SEP 04 2014

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY R. Malone  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION  
FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME*

Appellant has filed a motion seeking a 90-day extension of time to file the opening brief. As grounds for the extension, appellant points to her counsel's caseload and counsel's inability to timely complete the brief as a result. Counsel's caseload does not provide excusable neglect for noncompliance with rules, *see Varnum v. Grady*, 90 Nev. 374, 528 P.2d 1027 (1974), and the rules of appellate procedure clearly set forth the briefing deadlines, *see* NRAP 31(a)(1), and provide that briefing extensions beyond 30 days are not favored. *See* NRAP 31(b)(3)(B). Accordingly, we grant the motion for an extension of time in part. Appellant shall have 45 days from the date of this order to file and serve the opening brief and appendix. No further extensions of time will be granted absent extreme and unforeseen circumstances, which would not include counsel's caseload.

It is so ORDERED.

Libon, C.J.

cc: Potter Law Offices  
Clark County District Attorney/Civil Division