

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KEVIN PAUL DEBIPARSHAD, M.D.,  
AN INDIVIDUAL; KEVIN P.  
DEBIPARSHAD PLLC, D/B/A  
SYNERGY SPINE AND  
ORTHOPEDICS; DEBIPARSHAD  
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, LLC,  
D/B/A SYNERGY SPINE AND  
ORTHOPEDICS; ALLEGIANT  
INSTITUTE INC., A NEVADA  
DOMESTIC PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION, D/B/A ALLEGIANT  
SPINE INSTITUTE; JASWINDER S.  
GROVER, M.D., AN INDIVIDUAL; AND  
JASWINDER S. GROVER, M.D., LTD.,  
D/B/A NEVADA SPINE CLINIC,  
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE  
KERRY LOUISE EARLEY, DISTRICT  
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and  
JASON GEORGE LANDESS, A/K/A  
KAY GEORGE LANDESS,  
Real Party In Interest.

No. 81596

**FILED**

**NOV 18 2020**

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

*ORDER DENYING MOTION*

Real party in interest has filed a motion for leave to file an answer to the petition for writ of mandamus in excess of the type-volume limitation. See NRAP 21(d) (providing that absent leave of this court, an answer to a petition may not exceed 15 pages or 7,000 words). The

submitted answer consists of 13,825 words—which is almost double the length allowed. Petitioners filed a response contending that they do not oppose real party in interest's motion to exceed the type-volume limitation so long as they are allowed to file a reply of equal length.

This court “looks with disfavor on motions to exceed the applicable page limit or type-volume limitation, and therefore, permission to exceed the page limit or type-volume limitation will not be routinely granted.” NRAP 32(a)(7)(D)(i). Having considered the motion and the submitted answer, this court is not convinced that real party in interest demonstrates “diligence and good cause” warranting the filing of such a lengthy answer. *See id.* (“A motion to file a brief that exceeds the applicable page limit or type-volume limitation will be granted only upon a showing of diligence and good cause.”). Accordingly, the motion is denied.

The clerk shall strike the answer filed on October 14, 2020. Real party in interest shall have 21 days from the date of this order to file and serve an answer that complies with the page or type-volume limitations of NRAP 21(d). Alternatively, real party in interest may renew the motion to exceed the page or type-volume limitation within the same time period, if deemed warranted, provided that any such motion is accompanied by an answer that is significantly shorter and presents the facts and issues in a more concise manner.

It is so ORDERED.

Pickering, C.J.

cc: Hon. Kerry Louise Earley, District Judge  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP/Las Vegas  
Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg  
Howard & Howard Attorneys PLLC  
The Jimmerson Law Firm, P.C  
Eighth District Court Clerk