

RUTH L. COHEN, AN INDIVIDUAL, )  
 )  
 APPELLANT, )  
 )  
 vs. )  
 )  
 PAUL S. PADDA, AN INDIVIDUAL; )  
 PAUL PADDA LAW, PLLC, A NEVADA )  
 PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY )  
 COMPANY, )  
 )  
 RESPONDENTS. )  
 )  
 )

Electronically Filed  
 May 18 2021 04:55 p.m.  
 Elizabeth A. Brown  
 Clerk of Supreme Court  
 Case No. 81018

Pursuant to Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure 1(c), 26(b)(1)(A), 27 and 32(a)(7)(D), *amici* SABA-LV, VIPI and Jay Bloom respectfully request that the Court grant this motion to exceed the page limits of the Reply filed by amici on May 14, 2021 (but subsequently rejected by the Court pursuant to Notice issued on May 17, 2021). In the alternative, and only if the Court denies this motion to exceed page

limits, *amici* respectfully request that they be permitted an extension of time to file a conforming brief within one day after this motion is decided.

As correctly noted by the Court's Notice rejecting *amici*'s previously filed Reply, NRAP 27(d)(2) limits replies filed in connection with motions to only 5-pages (whereas appellate briefs are limited by word count). In this case, excluding the certificate of service, *amici*'s Reply was approximately 8 pages long. The reason this occurred was because *amici* utilized a 16-point proportional typeface for the Reply. Had *amici* utilized a different font and the smaller typeface permitted under NRAP 32(a)(5)(B), the Reply, excluding the certificate of service, would have been exactly five and a half pages (including the signature block). Unfortunately, counsel for *amici*, who is well acquainted with the requirements of 32(a)(7)(A)(ii), inadvertently overlooked the requirements of 27(d)(2) as the result of an honest mistake.

While motions to exceed page-limits are not routinely granted, in this case good cause and due diligence support this request to exceed the page limits given that *amici* utilized a larger typeface (good cause) and

are promptly responding (diligence) to the deficiency noted by the Court. As mentioned, had *amici* utilized the minimum typeface contemplated under NRAP 32(a)(5)(B), they would have exceeded the 5-page requirement by only half a page. Thus, despite the amount of words being the exact same between a 5.5-page Reply versus the 8-pages filed on May 14, 2021, the difference in typeface and font caused the difference.

The *amici* respectfully request that the Court grant this motion to exceed page limits for the reasons set forth above. Alternatively, should the Court deny this request, *amici* request leave to file a conforming brief that complies with the 5-page requirement. The Court may grant such leave pursuant to 26(b)(1)(A) for good cause. In this case, good cause exists to permit *amici* to file a Reply that conforms to the Court's requirements in order for full consideration to be given to the request for leave to file an amicus brief.

. . .

. . .

. . .

For the reasons set forth above, *amici* respectfully request that the Court grant the relief requested herein.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Milan Chatterjee*

---

Milan Chatterjee, Esq. (SBN #15159)  
4030 South Jones Blvd., #30370  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89173  
Tele: (702) 538-3749

Attorney for Amici Curiae  
SABA-LV, VIPI and Jay Bloom

Dated: May 18, 2021

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this day, May 18, 2021, the foregoing document entitled **SABA-LV, VIPI AND JAY BLOOM’S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITS OF REPLY OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A CONFORMING REPLY** was filed with the Supreme Court of Nevada through its electronic filing system. Service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List upon all registered parties and/or participants and their counsel.

/s/ Milan Chatterjee  
Milan Chatterjee, Esq.