

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

TRISHA KUPTZ-BLINKSOP, n/k/a
TRISHA MARGOLIS

Appellant

vs.

THOMAS R. BLINKINSOP

Respondent

Case # 78284

**OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT'S
SECOND MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME**

Electronically Filed
Sep 19, 2019 09:24 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Trisha initiated a partition action to enforce her ownership interest in the Subject Property located at 2042 Deer Springs Drive Henderson, NV 89074.

The Property has an approximate value of \$ 360,000. The loan balance is \$162,000. So about \$200,000 of equity is at issue.

The parties were married and there was a divorce decree in 2009. Tom was to receive the Subject Property, but the transfer was never effectuated and neither party renewed the decree.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Appellant timely filed her Opening Brief on July 26, 2019. Two weeks later Respondent requested an extension to file the Answering Brief, which Appellant granted.

Appellant has now filed a second month twelve days before the extended deadline.

1 BASIS OF THE OBJECTION

2
3 The body of the Opening Brief is a concise 15 pages. The appeal
4 focuses on application of two cases. Leven v. Frey 123 Nev. 399, 168 P.3d
5 712 (2007) and Davidson vs. Davidson, 132 Nev. 709, 382 P. 3d 887 (2016)

6 Leven is the seminal case interpreting NRS 17.214, the renewal of
7 judgment statute. The Davidson holding is that divorce decrees lapse just as
8 any other judgment, if not renewed.

9 The issues before the court are straightforward and should not require
10 extensive briefing or argument. Did the district court err in granting summary
11 judgment on Respondent's equitable issue, without any discovery? Does
12 Davidson apply to non-money provisions in a divorce decree?

13 These issues should not require extensive time to brief.

14 Respondent offers no justification other than counsel's self reported
15 busy schedule. The case has been on appeal for seven months and, while it's
16 obvious this is the lowest priority case in Respondent's counsel's office, proper
17 planning would have easily allowed a responsive brief to be prepared timely.

18
19 CONCLUSION

20
21 Appellant cannot agree, and therefore opposes, extension of time in
22 this matter. She desires that briefing be completed and the case be submitted
23 for decision.

24 /s/ Benjamin B. Childs

25 BENJAMIN B. CHILDS, ESQ.
26 Nevada Bar No. 3946
27 Attorney for Appellant