

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LARRY PORCHIA,

Appellant,

vs.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS; STEPHEN  
MASSA; NICHOLAS PAVELKA;  
WILLIAM HEADLEE; MARINA CLARK;  
JASON W. DRIGGERS; AND LVER  
RISK MANAGEMENT,

Respondents.

No. 78954

**FILED**

**MAY 07 2021**

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

**ORDER DISAPPROVING STIPULATION**

The parties have filed a stipulation for a second extension of time for appellant to file the supplemental brief ordered by this court. 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). Appellant previously received a telephonic extension of time to file the supplemental brief. Thus, the current stipulation for an extension of time is improper. Accordingly, the stipulation is disapproved. Appellant shall have 7 days from the date of this order to file and serve the supplemental brief. No further extensions of time shall be permitted absent extraordinary and compelling circumstances. *Id.* Counsel's caseload will not be deemed such a circumstance. *Varnum v. Grady*, 90 Nev. 374, 528 P.2d 1027 (1974).

It is so ORDERED.

J. Sanders, C.J.

cc: Olson, Cannon, Gormley, & Stoberski  
Las Vegas City Attorney