## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROBERT G. REYNOLDS, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND DIAMANTI FINE JEWELERS, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY,

Appellants,

RAFFI TUFENKJIAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; AND LUXURY
HOLDINGS LV, LLC, A NEVADA
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY,
Respondents.

No. 78187

NOV 0 1 2019

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

BY

DEPUTY CLERK

## ORDER FOR SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING

This is an appeal from a district court order granting a motion for summary judgment in an action for fraud/intentional misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation, breach of contract, and exploitation. Respondents represent that they executed upon appellants' personal property in satisfaction of a judgment and now own appellants' claims in this appeal. Respondents move to substitute themselves as appellants and dismiss this appeal.

Having considered the motion, opposition, and reply, this court concludes that supplemental briefing is warranted. The parties shall specifically address whether each of appellants' claims was properly assigned as a result of the execution. See, e.g., Achrem v. Expressway Plaza Ltd., 112 Nev. 737, 917 P.2d 447 (1996) (explaining that the rights to a tort action are not subject to assignment); Prosky v. Clark, 32 Nev. 441, 109 P. 793 (1910) (explaining that rights of action based upon fraud are not subject to assignment).

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

19-44998

The parties shall each have 15 days from the date of this order to file and serve a supplemental brief. The briefs shall not exceed 15 pages or the equivalent type-volume limitation. Failure to timely file a supplemental brief may result in the imposition of sanctions.

Briefing of this appeal is suspended pending further order of this court.<sup>1</sup>

It is so ORDERED.

/ Sarlesty, J.

Stiglich, J.

Silver J.

cc: Marx Law Firm, PLLC Marquis Aurbach Coffing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The motion to stay briefing or for an extension of time to file the answering brief is denied as moot.