1		
2		
3	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NE Mean anically File Feb 18 2022 02:2	0 p.m.
4	Elizabeth A. Brow Clerk of Supreme	
5	EFREN AGUIRRE JR.,	
6	Appellant,	
7	vs. CASE NO. 82445	
8	ELKO COUNTY SHERIFF'S	
9	OFFICE,	
10	Respondent.	
11		
12	MOTION TO STRIKE APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX-	
13	VOLUME 1	
14	COMES NOW, Respondent, State of Nevada, by and through its attorneys,	
15	TYLER J. INGRAM, District Attorney for the County of Elko, and RAND J.	
16	GREENBURG, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney, and submits this MOTION	
17	TYLER J. INGRAM Elko County District Attorney's Office RAND J. GREENBURG	
18	State Bar Number 13881 540 Court Street, 2 nd Floor	
19	Elko, NV 89801	
	(775) 738-3101	

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

FACTS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

On January 28, 2021, Appellant filed Notice of Appeal from the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Judgment of Forfeiture entered on December 31, 2020. Appellant and Respondent, at the commencement of this appeal to the Supreme Court of Nevada, met and conferred regarding filing a join appendix as required under NRAP Rule 30(a). Parties agreed to file a joint appendix and all the documents to be included in that appendix. Appellant's Opening Brief was filed on June 22, 2021, with the Joint Appendix.² Appellant's Reply Brief was filed on September 3, 2021, and included no Appendix.³ On November 3, 2021, Appellant filed APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX -VOLUME 1.4 The appendix includes Second Amended Declaration of Homestead recorded on November 1, 2021. Appellant did not confer with Respondent regarding Appellant's Supplemental Appendix Volume 1. Also, the Second Amended Declaration of Homestead was not part of the record before the district court.

17

18

19

¹ Docket entry 21-03538

² Docket entry 21-18023

³ Docket entry 21-25770

⁴ Docket entry 21-31640

ARGUMENT

A. APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX IS NOT PART OF THE RECORD

Under NRAP Rule 10(a), "The trial court record consists of the papers and exhibits filed in the district court, the transcript of the proceedings, if any, the district court minutes, and the docket entries made by the district clerk." NRAP Rule 30(g)(1) indicates, "Filing an appendix constitutes a representation by counsel that the appendix consists of true and correct copies of the papers in the district court file. Willful or grossly negligent filing of an appendix containing nonconforming copiers is an unlawful interference with the proceedings of the Supreme Court or Court of Appeals"

Appellant's Supplemental Appendix Volume 1 contains the Second Amended Declaration of Homestead. The Second Amended Declaration of Homestead was not in the record of the District Court, or part of those proceedings, and was not filed until several months after the commencement of the Appellant proceedings. Because the Second Amended Declaration of Homestead was not part of the record, the Court should strike the Appendix from the record.

- -

B. APPELLANT VIOLATED RULES OF APPELLANT PROCEDURE WHEN FILING THE APPENDIX

Under Rule 30(a) "Counsel have a duty to confer and attempt to reach an agreement concerning a possible joint appendix."

Appellant failed to confer with Respondent regarding Appellant's Supplemental Appendix Volume 1. Also, Respondent was under the impression that the parties were going to file a joint appendix. Appellant provided no notice, other than notice that the Appendix had been filed. Because Appellant did not confer with Respondent regarding the Appellant's Supplemental Appendix Volume 1, the Court should strike the Appendix from the record.

Also, under Rule 30(b)(3) and (5), appendix is to be filed with the Appellant's Brief or Reply. Appellant's Opening Brief was filed on June 22, 2021, with the Joint Appendix. Appellant's Reply Brief was filed on September 3, 2021, and included no Appendix. Appellant then filed the Supplemental Appendix on November 2, 2021. Because Appellant did not file the Appendix with Appellant's Opening or Reply Brief, Appellant violated the Nevada Rules of Appellant Procedure. Because Appellant violated the NRAP Rules, the Court should strike the Supplemental Appendix from the record.

C. CONCLUSION

Thus, because Appellant's Supplemental Appendix was not part of the district court record, and because Appellant violated NRAP rules in submitting the Supplemental Appendix, the Court should strike Appellant's Supplemental Appendix Volume 1 from the record.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 18th day of February, 2022.

TYLER J. INGRAM

- ~

Elko County District Attorney

By: RAND J. GREENBURG

Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney

State Bar Number: 13881

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on the 18th day of February, 2022, Electronic Service of the MOTION TO STRIKE APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX-VOLUME 1 shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows: **GERBER LAW OFFICE** Travis Gerber Zack Gerber auna L. Plunkett Shauna L. Plunkett **CASEWORKER** DA#: AP-18-03371