1	MICHAEL F. BOHN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No.: 1641		
2	mbohn@bohnlawfirm.com		
3	ADAM R. TRIPPIEDI, ESQ. Nevada Bar No.: 12294		
4	atrippiedi@bohnlawfirm.com BOHN & TRIPPIEDI	Electronically Filed	
5	2260 Corporate Cir, Suite 480 Henderson, Nevada 89074	Feb 23 2021 02:24 Elizabeth A. Brown	· p.m. I
6	(702) 642-3113/ (702) 642-9766 FAX Attorney for Respondent	Clerk of Supreme (Court
7	SUPREME COURT		
8	STATE OF NEVADA		
9	DAPHNE WILLIAMS,	No. 80350	
10	ŕ	140. 80330	
11	Appellant,		
12	VS.		
13	CHARLES "RANDY" LAZER,		
14	Respondent.		
15		EOD CLADIFICATION	
16	RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION REGARDING LENGTH OF ANSWERING BRIEF		
17	Adam R. Trippiedi, Esq.		
18	Bohn & Trippiedi 2260 Corporate Circle, Ste. 480		
19	Henderson, Nevada 89074 (702) 642-3113/ (702) 642-9766 Fax		
20	(702) 642-3113/ (702) 642-9766 Fax Attorney for Plaintiff/Respondent Charles "Randy" Lazer		
21	///		
	///		
22	///		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	1		
	1		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

26

27

Respondent Charles "Randy" Lazer, by and through his attorney, Adam R. Trippiedi, Esq., hereby moves this court for clarification regarding the length of Respondent's Answering Brief. This motion is based on the declaration of Adam R. Trippiedi, Esq., as stated below.

DATED this 23rd day of February, 2021

BOHN & TRIPPIEDI

By: / s /Adam R. Trippiedi, Esq.
Michael F. Bohn, Esq.
Adam R. Trippiedi, Esq.
2260 Corporate Circle, Suite 480
Henderson, Nevada 89074
Attorneys for Respondent

DECLARATION OF ADAM R. TRIPPIEDI, ESQ.

ADAM R. TRIPPIEDI, ESQ. states:

- 1. Declarant is the attorney for the Respondent in this case and makes this declaration based upon personal knowledge.
- 2. On February 4, 2021, this Court entered an order directing Respondent to file an Answering Brief in response to Appellant's Petition for Review.
- 3. On February 16, 2021, this Court entered an order granting Respondent's telephonic request for an extension of time to file an Answering Brief, thereby extending the deadline to March 4, 2021.
- 4. On February 22, 2021, this Court entered an order directing Respondent to file a brief responding to not only Appellant's Petition for Review, but also to

the amicUS briefs filed by the ACLU and the First Amendment Lawyers Association respectively.

- 5. As a result, Respondent must now file one brief in response to three briefs.
- 6. NRAP 40(B) does not explicitly set a word or page limit for a brief filed in response to a Petition for Review. As a result, Respondent planned to follow the page and word limits applicable to the Petition for Review as contained in NRAP 40(B)(d).
- 7. However, because Respondent must now respond to three separate briefs, Respondent is requesting guidance and relief from this Court as to the page and word limitations for Respondent's Answering Brief.
- 8. This Court's February 22, 2021, order does not provide specifications as to the word or page limit for Respondent's Answering Brief.
- 9. On February 23, 2021, I called the Nevada Supreme Court Clerk's Office and spoke with an employee who informed me that my best option would be to file a motion with the court to clarify any concerns I had regarding the February 22, 2021, order.
- 10. Accordingly, Respondent hereby requests this Court allow Respondent a word limitation of 9,333 words in Respondent's Answering Brief.
 - 11. Under NRAP 40B(a)(3), Appellant's word limitation was 4,667.
 - 12. Further, under NRAP 29(e), each amicus brief was limited to half of the

length of Appellant's Petition for Review, or 2,333 words per amicus brief.

- 13. Thus, the combined word limitation of the three filed briefs supporting Appellant's position is 9,333.
- 14. Allowing Respondent a word limitation of 9,333 would be a fair resolution to the issue of Respondent having to file one brief in response to three separate briefs.
- 15. If this Court is unwilling to allow 9,333 words for Respondent's Answering Brief, Respondent requests a word-limit increase of whatever amount this Court is willing to provide.
- 16. I declare under penalties of perjury under the law of the state of Nevada that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 23rd day of February, 2021

/s/ Adam R. Trippiedi, Esq. ADAM R. TRIPPIEDI, ESQ.