

1 BRANDON L. PHILLIPS, ESQ
Nevada Bar No. 12264
2 BRANDON L. PHILLIPS, ATTORNEY AT LAW, PLLC
1455 E. Tropicana Ave., Suite 750
3 Las Vegas, NV 89119
P: (702) 795-0097; F: (702) 795-0098
4 blp@abetterlegalpractice.com
Attorney for Appellant, L. Bulen

Electronically Filed
Sep 01 2021 11:19 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

6 SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

7 STEVE SANSON, an
8 Individual; ROB LAUER, an
9 Individual,,
10 Appellant,

11 vs.

12 LAWRA KASSEE BULEN, an
13 individual
14 Respondent(s).

SUPREME COURT CASE
NO. 82393
DISTRICT COURT CASE NO.:
A-18-784807-C

16 **APPELLANT'S FOURTH REQUEST TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE**
17 **DOCKETING STATEMENT AND OPPOSITION TO APPEALANTS'**
18 **MOTION TO DEEM FAILURE OF RESPONDENT TO FILE AN**
ANSWERING BRIEF AS CONFESSION OF ERROR

19 Now comes Appellant, Lawra Kassee Bulen, through her counsel of record,
20 Brandon L. Phillips, Esq., of the firm BRANDON L. PHILLIPS, ATTORNEY AT
21 LAW, PLLC, and hereby respectfully requests that this honorable Court extend the
22 time for Appellant to file the Respondent's Answering Brief.
23
24

1 There is simply no sugar coating the fact that the Respondent missed the
2 deadline issued by the Supreme Court to file the Answering Brief that was issued
3 on August 20, 2021. The Answering Brief is attached hereto in full and ready to be
4 filed with the Supreme Court.
5

6 The deadline was missed, but it was not intentional and was not intended
7 cause any delay with the Court rendering a decision on the Appeal. However, it
8 should be noted for the record that the Respondent's counsel took on this appeal
9 pro bono. Respondent's counsel believes that the Appellants' efforts to further ruin
10 Respondent's life is worth fighting against. Respondent's have the backing of a
11 large social media and online newspaper following to support the efforts to
12 countlessly spend to pursue additional sanctions against the Respondent.
13

14 Unfortunately, due to the Covid pandemic Respondent's counsel's staff has
15 been reduced to the attorney and one assistant. Shortly after the Granting of the
16 Motion, counsel for Respondent had to travel out-of-state to Alabama to secure and
17 finish houses to protect them from the quickly approaching hurricane Ida. That is
18 not excuse for missing the deadline as it still should have been filed. However, the
19 issues are extraordinary and required immediate attention.
20

21 Further, Respondent's counsel reached out to discuss the matter with
22 Appellants' counsel on August 30, 2021, but did not receive a return phone call.
23
24

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

(a) Time for Serving and Filing Briefs. Unless a different briefing schedule is provided by a court order in a particular case or by these or any other court rules, parties shall observe the briefing schedule set forth in this Rule.

(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 (including a 5-day telephonic extension), and if extensions were granted, the original date when the brief was due;
- (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; and
- (v) The length of the extension requested and the date on which the brief would become due.

The bottom line is this, the Appellants have in no way been harmed by any of the delays in this Appeal. There is a related appeal arising from the same case, Appeal No. 81854. The Supreme Court should not and is not likely to rule on this Appeal until a decision on No. 81854 is decided. The Opening Brief and Answering Brief has been filed in that Appeal and the Supreme Court could render a decision on that Appeal any day. Should the Supreme Court grant the appeal then this instant Appeal is likely moot. Appellants' have already seen Respondent's

1 Answering Brief as it was attached to the Motion to Extend Time to File the
2 Answering Brief. Appellants are clearly aware that Respondent does not agree that
3 discretion should be removed from the District Court judges.
4

5 Further, the Appeal at issue asks the Supreme Court to enter a new standard
6 for Nevada courts in deciding whether to make it mandatory for up to \$10,000
7 sanctions to be issued in the event an Anti-SLAPP Motion to Dismiss is granted.
8 Currently, case law allows for judicial discretion to be had when determining to
9 whether to grant the additional up to \$10,000 sanction.
10

11 Finally, such a request is far overreaching, but even with a timely Response
12 from the Respondent, the Supreme Court's decision in this matter is likely to be
13 unaffected by Respondent's Response Brief. Respondent's Brief can be summed
14 up in twenty-two (22) words, "the Court should not remove discretion on the issue
15 of additional sanctions from the sitting District Court judge hearing the Anti-
16 SLAPP motion."
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 Respondent's Brief is attached hereto and is ready to be filed. Respondent
3
4 respectfully requests this Court grant the extension of time or issue an order to the
5 Clerk to accept the attached Responding Brief and then deny Appellant's request
6 for sanctions.

7
8 _____
 /s/ *Brandon L. Phillips*

9 BRANDON L. PHILLIPS, ESQ.
10 Nevada Bar No. 12264
11 Brandon L. Phillips, Attorney at Law, PLLC
12 1455 E. Tropicana Ave., Suite 750
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
14 702-795-0097, 702-795-0098fax
15 blp@abetterlegalpractice.com
16 Attorney for Respondent, *K. Bulen*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

An employee of BRANDON L. PHILLIPS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW, PLLC