

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FIELDEN HANSON ISAACS MIYADA
ROBISON YEH, LTD.,

Appellant,

vs.

DEVIN CHERN TANG, M.D.; AND SUN
ANESTHESIA SOLUTIONS, A
NEVADA CORPORATION,

Respondents.

No. 78358

FILED

FEB 04 2020

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER

Respondents have filed a motion for a second extension of time to file the answering brief. Once a party receives a telephonic extension of time to perform an act, further extensions of time to perform that same act are barred unless the moving party files a motion for an extension of time demonstrating extraordinary and compelling circumstances in support of the requested extension. NRAP 26(b)(1)(B); NRAP 31(b)(3)(A)(iv). Respondents previously received a telephonic extension of time to file the answering brief. Accordingly, respondents must demonstrate extraordinary and compelling circumstances in order to receive a second extension of time.

In support of the current motion, counsel states that counsel have been working on a separate case that is proceeding to trial and have briefed 30 motions in limine in connection with that case. This court is not convinced that counsel demonstrates extraordinary and compelling circumstances. Nevertheless, in this instance only, the motion is granted. Respondents shall have until February 26, 2020, to file and serve the answering brief. Failure to timely file the answering brief may result in the

imposition of sanctions, including the disposition of this appeal without an answering brief from respondents. NRAP 31(d).

It is so ORDERED.

Pickering, C.J.

cc: Dickinson Wright PLLC
Howard & Howard Attorneys PLLC