

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ALI SHAHROKHI,
Appellant,
vs.
KIZZY J. S. BURROW A/K/A KIZZY
BURROW,
Respondent.

ALI SHAHROKHI,
Appellant,
vs.
KIZZY BURROW,
Respondent.

No. 81978

FILED

FEB 18 2021

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

No. 82245

*ORDER CONSOLIDATING CASES, DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO FILE STAY MOTION WITH EXCESS PAGES,
AND GRANTING MOTIONS TO FILE TRANSCRIPTS UNDER SEAL*

These are pro se appeals from a district court order finally determining child custody (Docket No. 81978) and a post-judgment district court order awarding attorney fees (Docket No. 82245). Appellant has filed a motion for leave to file an emergency stay motion with excess pages in Docket No. 82245, and motions to file transcripts under seal in both dockets.

Preliminarily, as these appeals arise from the same district court case and involve the same parties and related issues, their consolidation would promote judicial economy. Accordingly, these appeals are consolidated for all appellate purposes. NRAP 3(b). Appellant shall have until April 8, 2021, to file and serve a single opening brief or informal brief form addressing the issues in both of these consolidated cases.

In Docket No. 82245, appellant has moved for leave to file a 25-page motion for stay, which is more than twice the length allowed by NRAP

27(d)(2). The proposed stay motion does not acknowledge appellant's ability to obtain an automatic stay of the money judgment under NRCP 62(d) by filing a supersedeas bond in the district court, *see Nelson v. Heer*, 121 Nev. 832, 836, 122 P.3d 1252, 1254 (2005) (explaining that, upon motion and under certain circumstances, the district court may reduce or waive the NRCP 62(d) bond amount or allow alternate security), and while appellant suggests that first seeking relief in the district court under NRAP 8(a) would be impracticable because the district court has warned against filing frivolous and repetitive motions and has demonstrated bias, such allegations do not demonstrate impracticability, especially in light of the denial of appellant's motions to disqualify the district judge. Nor is the length of the proposed stay motion necessary to provide this court with a complete understanding of the requested relief. Therefore, the motion for leave to file an overlength stay motion is denied, and the clerk of this court is directed to return, unfiled, the February 11, 2021, proposed motion.

Finally, appellant's motions for leave to file transcripts under seal, filed in both dockets, are granted, as the case was sealed below. SRCR 7. Accordingly, the clerk shall file under seal the transcripts provisionally received in both dockets on February 12, 2021.

It is so ORDERED.

 _____, C.J.

cc: Ali Shahrokhi
Standish Law
Bremer Whyte Brown & O'Meara, LLP/Las Vegas