

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

\* \* \* \* \*

ERICH M. MARTIN,

Appellant,

vs.

RAINA MARTIN,

Respondent.

S.C. No.:

D.C. Case No.:

Electronically Filed  
Mar 29 2022 03:22 p.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

82517

D-15-50949-D

**MOTION TO ADJUST DUE DATE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL**

**ANSWERING BRIEF**

Respondent, Raina Martin, by and through her attorneys of record, Marshal S. Willick, Esq., and Richard L. Crane, Esq., of the WILLICK LAW GROUP, respectfully requests that this Court adjust the time in which she must file her Supplement Answering Brief to 21 days after the filing of the *Amicus Curiae* Brief filed in support of Appellant to allow her to respond to their argument.<sup>1</sup>

This *Motion* is based upon the Points and Authorities below, and is made in good faith and not to delay justice.

---

<sup>1</sup> NRAP 27.

## POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

### I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Court of Appeals filed its Order Affirming in Part, Reversing in Part and Remanding on November 17, 2021.

Raina filed her Petition for Review December 3, 2021. The Court directed Appellant, Erich Martin, to file an Answer to the Petition for Review within 14 days.

The Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers expressed its desire to file a Brief of *Amicus Curiae* on December 21, 2021.

After a few extensions of time, Erich filed his Answer to Raina's Petition for Review on January 28, 2022.

The Court then ordered the Parties to file supplement briefs in this matter on February 14, 2022. In the same *Order*, the Court invited *Amicus Curiae* briefs to aid in the Court's decision. Erich's supplemental brief was originally due on February 28, 2022, but extended on his request to March 21, 2022. His two-page brief did not address any of the merits of the issues before the Court.

Third parties filed their *Motions for Extension of Time to File Amicus Curiae Briefs* on March 14 and March 28. Those briefs have not yet been filed.

This *Motion* follows.

## II. ARGUMENT

As Raina is the Respondent in this matter, she is to address the issues as presented by the Appellant.<sup>2</sup> His filed brief lacked any issues for review, provided no argument on the merits, and did not provide the Court with any citations to or argument concerning current cases recently decided in this subject throughout the country.

Raina was prepared to begin her brief when the most recent request for an extension of time to file was submitted by “Trinity Advocates.” Trinity intends to file an amicus brief in support of Erich; as this Court has invited amicus participation, that request is expected to be granted.

Normally, the brief of any amicus is to be filed shortly after the brief of the party it supports, in part so the remainder of the briefing by the parties can address the arguments made by amicus to make this Court’s review of all issues raised more efficient and complete. *See* NRAP 29. This Court has not yet set a due date for the proposed amicus brief by Trinity.

---

<sup>2</sup> Respondent’s Brief is filed after the Appellant’s Brief to allow for the Respondent to address all of the issues raised by the Appellant. *See* NRAP 28.

Since Erich did not actually address the merits of this case, we believe that it would be in the interest of justice and aid the Court in its determination of the issues, to allow Trinity to file their brief and then to allow Raina to address any issues raised in it in her *Answering Brief*.

Trinity's request for an extension of time asks to be allowed to file their brief concurrently with the Amicus brief being filed by the Nevada Family Law Section (i.e., an amicus brief which support Raina, the Respondent). Since the Trinity brief will be the only supplemental brief filed in support of *Erich*, the Appellant, we believe it should be filed prior to the *Answering Brief* so its contentions can be addressed in writing. The *Respondent's Answering Brief* should be due *following* that filing. This would allow Raina the opportunity to respond to all issues raised in the case, and hopefully benefit this Court's review.

### III. CONCLUSION

Raina requests that the Court adjust the due date for the *Supplemental Answering Brief* to be 21 days following the filing of the Trinity *Amicus* brief.

Dated March 29, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,  
WILLICK LAW GROUP

//s// Marshal S. Willick  
Marshal S. Willick, Esq.

P:\wp19\MARTIN,R\SCDRAFTS\00554150.WPD\jj

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the WILLICK LAW GROUP and that on this 29th day of March, 2022, a document entitled *Motion to Adjust Due Date to File Supplemental Answering Brief* was filed electronically with the Clerk of the Nevada Supreme Court, and therefore electronic service was made in accordance with the master service list as follows, to the attorneys listed below at the address, email address, and/or facsimile number indicated below:

Attorneys for Appellant:  
Chad F. Clement, Esq.  
Kathleen A. Wilde, Esq.  
Marquis Aurbach Coffing  
10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
Telephone: (702) 382-0711  
Facsimile: (702) 382-5816  
[Cclement@maclaw.com](mailto:Cclement@maclaw.com)  
[Kwilde@maclaw.com](mailto:Kwilde@maclaw.com)

//s// Justin K. Johnson

---

An Employee of WILLICK LAW GROUP