IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SONJIA MACK,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Appellant,

VS.

BRIAN WILLIAMS; JAMES DZURENDA; ARTHUR EMLING, Jr.; and MYRA LAURIAN;

Respondents.

Electronically Filed Case No.: 815Dec 23 2021 12:19 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPLY BRIEF

First Request

Pursuant to Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure ("NRAP") 26(b)(1)(B) and 31(b)(3), Appellant SONJIA MACK ("Appellant" or "Ms. Mack") hereby submits her first Motion for Extension of Time to File Reply Brief, which Reply Brief is filed concurrently herewith. This Motion is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities and attached Declaration of Nathan E. Lawrence, Esq., counsel for Appellant.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

T. INTRODUCTION

Appellant untimely filed her Reply Brief on December 22, 2021, thirty (30) days after Respondents' Answering Brief. Pursuant to the Court's July 21, 2021, Order Accepting Certified Questions, Directing Briefing, and Directing Submission

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

28

of Filing Fee, Appellant's Reply Brief was required twenty-one (21) days after Respondent's Answering Brief, on December 13, 2021. Appellant's untimely brief, in short, was filed late solely as a result of an internal calendaring error on the part of Appellant's counsel. In consideration of extensions granted to other parties to the instant matter and for good cause shown, Appellant hereby respectfully requests the Court grant Appellant's Motion for Extension of Time to File Reply Brief and accept Appellant's Reply Brief, filed concurrently herewith.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

- 1. On July 24, 2020, the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada issued its Order Certifying Questions to the Supreme Court of Nevada.
- On July 21, 2021, this Court issued its Order Accepting Certified 2. Questions, Directing Briefing, and Directing Submission of Filing Fee, setting a briefing schedule as follows:
 - a. Appellant shall have 30 days from the date of this order to file and serve an opening brief (August 20, 2021).
 - b. Respondents shall have 30 days from the date of the opening brief is served to file and serve an answering brief.
 - c. Appellant shall then have 21 days from the date the answering brief is served to file and serve and reply brief.
- 3. On August 16, 2021, Appellant timely presented a telephonic request for extension of time to file her Opening Brief, pursuant to which, Appellant was granted until September 3, 2021, to file
 - 4. On September 3, 2021, Appellant filed her Opening Brief

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

28

- 5. On September 3, 2021, at request of Respondents' counsel, the parties stipulated to an extension of time for Respondents to file their Answering Brief until November 8, 2021.
- 6. On November 8, 2021, following filings in the intervening period of certain amicus briefs, Respondents moved the court for a fourteen-day extension of time file their Answering Brief, until November 22, 2021, which unopposed motion the Court duly granted.
- 7. On November 22, 2021, Respondents filed their Answering Brief, further to which filing, Appellant's deadline to file a Reply Brief was December 13, 2021.
- 8. On December 22, 2021, due to an internal calendaring error, Appellant filed her Reply Brief.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

NRAP 26(b)(1)(B) allows that, "[f]or good cause, the court may extend the time prescribed by these Rules or by its order to perform any act, or may permit an act to be done after that time expires." An extension of time shall be made on Motion under NRAP 31(b)(3), comporting with the following requirements:

- (A) Contents of Motion. A motion for extension of time for filing a brief shall include the following:
 - (i) The date when the brief is due;
 - (ii) The number of extensions of time previously granted...

- (iii) Whether any previous requests for extensions of time have been denied or denied in part;
- (iv) The reasons or grounds why an extension is necessary (including demonstrating extraordinary and compelling circumstances under Rule 26(b)(1)(B), if required); and
- (v) The length of the extension requested and the date on which the brief would become due.
- (B) ... The court will grant an initial motion for extension of time for filing a brief only upon a clear showing of good cause. The court shall not grant additional extensions of time except upon a showing of extraordinary circumstances and extreme need.

IV. ARGUMENT

As noted, Appellant's Reply Brief was due on December 13, 2021, and no prior extension of time has been requested (nor, obviously, denied). The reason why the extension is simple, yet unfortunate: Appellant's counsel made an internal calendaring error, setting the deadline for thirty (30) days after the filing of Respondents' Answering Brief. By counsel's own internal calendaring, the Reply Brief was timely, though, clearly, as to the Court's calendar, it was not. As the Reply Brief is already prepared (as filed on December 22, 2021) and will be filed again concurrently with this Motion, Appellant is requesting only a ten-day extension, setting the new due date for the Reply Brief as December 23, 2021. The applicable NRAP provisions do not, for the instant matter, require a showing of extraordinary and compelling circumstances or extreme need. Counsel's internal calendaring error, constituting excusable neglect, reasonably meets the relevant

standard of good cause.

The Court has been generous with allowing extensions of time in the instant matter, and Appellant has made all efforts to be so as well, working with Respondents' counsel to accommodate their schedule for their Answering Brief, not opposing their prior motion for extension of time. The instant motion and request for extension is sought in good faith and not for any undue purpose of delay, nor does Appellant believe that this singular extension prejudices Respondents in any way.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Appellant hereby respectfully requests the Court grant Appellant's Motion for Extension of Time to File Reply Brief to December 23, 2021, and accept Appellant's Reply Brief, filed concurrently herewith.

DATED this 23rd day of December 2021.

GALLIAN WELKER & BECKSTROM, L.C.

TRAVIS N. BARRICK, F/sq., SBN 9257

NATHAN E. LAWRENCE, Esq., SBN 15060

540 East St. Louis Avenue

Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

Tel: (702) 892-3500

Attorney for Appellant Sonjia Mack

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SONJIA MACK,

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

28

Appellant,

VS.

BRIAN WILLIAMS; JAMES DZURENDA; ARTHUR EMLING, Jr.; and MYRA LAURIAN;

Respondents.

Case No.: 81513

DECLARATON OF NATHAN E. LAWRENCE, Esq., IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPLY BRIEF

- I, Nathan E. Lawrence, Esq., being first duly sworn and under penalty of perjury, state as follows:
- 1. I am a resident of Clark County, Nevada, over the age of 18 years old, and I am competent to testify from my own personal knowledge concerning the matters contained herein.
- 2. I am counsel for Appellant SONJIA MACK ("Ms. Mack") in the above-referenced matter, and I hereby make this Declaration in support of Ms. Mack's Motion for Extension of Time to File Reply Brief (First Request).
- 9. On November 22, 2021, Respondents filed their Answering Brief, further to which filing, in accord with the Court's July 21, 2021, Order Accepting

Certified Questions, Directing Briefing, and Directing Submission of Filing Fee, Appellant's deadline to file a Reply Brief was December 13, 2021.

- 10. Due to an internal calendaring error, the deadline for the Reply Brief was set for December 22, 2021, thirty (30) days after the filing of the Answering Brief (instead of twenty-one (21), as required).
- 11. Solely as a result of the noted calendaring error, Appellant's Reply Brief was untimely filed.
- 12. Appellant's motion for extension of time is sought in good faith and not for any undue purpose of delay
- 13. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada that the foregoing is true and correct.

Further, Declarant sayeth naught.

Nathan E. Lawrence, SEN 15060

GALLIAN WELKER & BECKSTROM, L.C.

540 East St. Louis Avenue

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that on the 23rd day of December 2021, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPLY BRIEF** as filed, by way of the Supreme Court's electronic filing system to the following:

AARON D. FORD, Attorney General

Kiel B. Ireland (Bar No. 15368C)
Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
555 East Washington Avenue, Suite 3900
Attorney for Respondents

DATED this 23rd day of December 2021.

GALLIAN WELKER & BECKSTROM, L.C.

TRAVIS N. BARRICK, Esq., SBN 9257

NATHAN E. LAWRENCE, Esq., SBN 15060

540 East St. Louis Avenue

Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

Tel: (702) 892-3500

Attorney for Appellant Sonjia Mack