1	R. DUANE FRIZELL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9807	
2	FRIZELL LAW FIRM, PLLC	
3	400 N. Stephanie St., Suite 265 Henderson, Nevada 89014	
4	Office (702) 657-6000	Floatronically Filad
	Facsimile (702) 657-0065 DFrizell@FrizellLaw.com	Electronically Filed Jul 27 2021 05:51 p.m.
5	Attorney for Appellants/	Elizabeth A. Brown
6	Cross-Respondents	Clerk of Supreme Cour
7	1	UPREME COURT
8	OF THE S	TATE OF NEVADA
9	BETTY CHAN; and ASIAN	§
10	AMERICAN REALTY &	§
11	PROPERTY MANAGEMENT,	§ 8
12	Appellants/Cross-Respondents,	<pre> § § § SUPREME COURT CASE NO. 82208 §</pre>
13	VS.	§ District Court Case No. A-16-744109-C
14		§
15	WAYNE WU; JUDITH SULLIVAN; NEVADA REAL	§ Eighth Judicial District Court
16	ESTATE CORP.; and JERRIN	§ (Hon. Eric Johnson)
17	CHIU;	<pre>§ (Hon. Eric Johnson) § § §</pre>
18	Respondents/Cross-Appellants.	\$ \$ \$
19		
20		SED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF O RESPONDENTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
21		OND REQUEST)
22	Appellants/Cross-Respondent	s BETTY CHAN ("Chan") and ASIAN
2324	AMERICAN REALTY & PROPE	ERTY MANAGEMENT ("Asian American")
25	(collectively "Appellants" or "Cross	-Respondents") seek an extension of seven (7)
26	<u>days</u> to file an opposition to Response	ondents' pending Motion to Dismiss. To that
27	end, they now file this, Appellants	' Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to
28	File Opposition to Respondents' Mo	otion to Dismiss (Second Request). In support
	I and the second	1

of the present Motion for Extension of Time, Appellants would respectfully show the Court as follows:

Appellants have already received one telephonic extension of 14 days to file an opposition to *Respondents' Motion to Dismiss Second Appeal* (filed Jul. 6, 2021) ["Motion to Dismiss"]. NRAP 26(b)(1)(B) provides that "[t]he grant of [such] an extension of time to perform an act under this Rule will bar any further extensions of time to perform the same act unless the party files a written motion for an extension of time demonstrating extraordinary and compelling circumstances why a further extension of time is necessary." Although Rule 31(b)(3)(A), relates to extensions of time to file a brief, rather than a response to a motion, it requires five items (i-v) to be set forth in a motion to extend, including a description of the "extraordinary and compelling circumstances" under NRAP 26(b)(1)(B), if necessary. Each of those items are set forth and addressed below.

(i) The date when the opposition is due;

Appellants' opposition is currently due <u>July 27, 2021</u>. (Order Granting Telephonic Extension (filed Jul. 13, 2021) [hereafter "Order" or "Ord."]).

(ii) The number of extensions of time previously granted (including a 14-day telephonic extension), and if extensions were granted, the original date when the opposition was due;

The Court has previously granted Appellants one (1) extension of time to file their opposition. (Ord.). The opposition was originally due <u>July 13, 2021</u>. See NRAP 27(a)(3)(A).

///

(iii) Whether any previous requests for extensions of time have been denied or denied in part;

Appellants/Cross-Respondents' first and only previous request was made telephonically pursuant to NRAP 26(b)(1)(B). (Ord.). The Court granted a 14-day extension thereunder, making the new deadline <u>July 27, 2021</u>. (Ord.).

(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

NRAP 26(b)(1)(A) provides: "For 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." NRAP 26(b)(1)(B) provides:

Except as otherwise provided in these Rules, a party may, on or before the due date sought to be extended, request by telephone a single 14-day extension of time for performing any act except the filing of a notice of appeal. If good cause is shown, the clerk may grant such a request by telephone or by written order of the clerk. The grant of an extension of time to perform an act under this Rule will bar any further extensions of time to perform the same act unless the party files a written motion for an extension of time demonstrating extraordinary and compelling circumstances why a further extension of time is necessary.

(Emphasis added).

For the reasons discussed below, Appellants would submit that they have satisfied the requirements of "good cause" and "extraordinary and compelling circumstances" under both subsections (A) and (B) of NRAP 26(b)(1). Given Appellants' prior motion to seek an extension of time to file their *opening and brief and appendix*, it would appear that Appellants' counsel's family conveniently has a medical emergency whenever there is a deadline in this case. If counsel were

not living it, he would not believe it either. That said, on July 26, 2021 (the day before the current deadline for Appellants' opposition), counsel's high-school age son unexpectedly had a severe medical emergency that required his immediate admission to the Emergency Room and later ICU. Even as counsel is writing this motion, counsel's son remains in ICU, has yet to be discharged, and may be required to remain in the hospital.

Prior and up to the date of counsel's son's hospital admission, counsel had been working on the opposition to Respondent's Motion to Dismiss. Nevertheless, he requires more time to work on the opposition, complete it, and file it. Counsel believes seven (7) days would be sufficient.

Appellants' counsel reached out to Respondents' attorney about the matter. (*Exhibit 1*). Respondents' attorney said that he did not object to a seven (7) day extension. (*Id.*). Therefore, Appellants' motion is unopposed. (*Id.*).

(v) The length of the extension requested and the date on which the brief would become due.

Appellants are requesting a <u>seven (7) day extension</u>, which would make the new deadline <u>August 3, 2021</u>.

WHEREFORE, Appellants/Cross-Respondents BETTY CHAN ("Chan") and ASIAN AMERICAN REALTY & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT ("Asian American") (collectively "Appellants" or "Cross-Respondents") hereby request the Court as follows:

1. to grant Appellants' Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to File Opposition to Respondents' Motion to Dismiss (Second Request);

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

- 2. to extend the deadline for Appellants to file their opposition to Respondent's Motion to Dismiss from *July 27, 2021 (old deadline)* to *August 3, 2021 (new deadline)*; and
- 3. to grant Appellants all such other and further relief that they justly deserve or to which they may be entitled at law or in equity.

DATED: *July 27, 2021*.

FRIZELL LAW FIRM, PLLC 400 N. Stephanie St., Suite 265 Henderson, NV 89014

By: /s/ R. Duane Frizell

R. DUANE FRIZELL, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9807

Attorney for Appellants/

Cross-Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1	OBKITITE OF SERVICE	
2 3	I hereby certify pursuant to NRAP 25(c), that on <u>July 27, 2021</u> , I served true and correct copy of the forgoing APPELLANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTIO FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENTS	
4	MOTION TO DISMISS (SECOND REQUEST), together with any and a	
5	exhibits and other attachments, via the Supreme Court's Electronic Filing Syste to the following:	
6		
7	MICHAEL A. OLSEN, ESQ. Nevada State Bar No. 6076	
8	THOMAS R. GROVER, ESQ.	
9	Nevada State Bar No. 12387	
10	KEITH D. ROUTSONG, ESQ. Nevada State Bar No. 14944	
11	BLACKROCK LEGAL, LLC	
12	10155 W. Twain Ave., Suite 100	
13	Las Vegas, Nevada 89147 Attorneys for Respondents/Cross-	
	Appellants Wayne Wu, Judith	
14	Sullivan, Nevada Real Estate Corp.,	
15	and Jerrin Chiu	
16		
17		
18		
19	<u>_/s/ R. Duane Frízell</u>	
20	R. DUANE FRIZELL, ESQ. Nevada Bar. No 9807	
21	Attorney for Appellants/	
22	Cross-Respondents	
23		
24		
25		
26 27		
7.1	1	

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

Duane Frizell

From: Mike Olsen <mike@blackrocklawyers.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 4:31 PM

To: Duane Frizell

Cc: Keith Routsong; Aiqin Niu

Subject: Re: Chan v Wu

Of course and best wishes for your son.

Mike



Michael A. Olsen, Esq. Managing Partner 10155 West Twain Avenue, Suite 100 Las Vegas, NV 89147 T: 702.855.5658

F: 702.869.8243

This message and any file(s) or attachment(s) transmitted herewith are confidential, intended for the named recipient only, and may contain information that is a trade secret, proprietary, protected by attorney work product doctrine, subject to attorney-client privilege, or is otherwise protected against unauthorized use or disclosure. This message and any file(s) or attachment(s) transmitted herewith are based on a reasonable expectation of privacy consistent with ABA Formal Opinion No. 99-413. Any disclosure, distribution, copying, or use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient, regardless of address or routing, is strictly prohibited. If you receive this message in error, please advise the sender by immediate reply and delete the original message. Thank you. Blackrock Legal – Attorneys at law

From: Duane Frizell <dfrizell@frizelllaw.com>
Date: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 at 3:48 PM

To: Mike Olsen <mike@blackrocklawyers.com>

Cc: Keith Routsong <keith@blackrocklawyers.com>, Aiqin Niu <aniu@frizelllaw.com>

Subject: Chan v Wu

Mike:

I know. It seems like my family conveniently has a medical emergency whenever there is a deadline in this case. If I weren't living it, I wouldn't believe it either. That said, yesterday my son had one and is still in the hospital. He may be there a few more days. Honest truth. Would you agree to 7-day extension of my deadline to file an opposition to your motion to dismiss? Please let me know. Thank you.

—Duane

Sent from my iPhone