

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BARRICK GOLD CORPORATION,

Case No. 83415

Petitioner,

vs.

Electronically Filed
Jan 14 2022 11:35 a.m.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF
NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE
COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE
HONORABLE ELIZABETH
GONZALEZ, DISTRICT JUDGE,
DEPT. XI,

Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court
**PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO
REAL PARTY IN INTEREST'S
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME TO FILE ANSWER TO
PETITION**

Respondent,

and

BULLION MONARCH
MINING, INC.,

Real Party in Interest.

Petitioner Barrick Gold Corporation sought a writ, because of a significant issue of jurisdiction, in a case with an upcoming trial.¹ At Real Party in Interest's request, Petitioner agreed to a 30-day extension of its time to file an answer to the petition. On the final day of that extended time, Real Party in Interest filed the instant motion, seeking another 30 days to answer the petition.

Petitioner has extended (and continues to extend) reasonable professional courtesies in this and other cases, even more so given the current health crisis. But with litigation pressing on, and the recent administrative order related to trial

¹ Petitioner originally sought writ relief on this jurisdictional issue on January 22, 2021, Case No. 82370. Real Party in Interest moved to dismiss on mootness grounds after it filed a third amended complaint. This Court granted the motion to dismiss on mootness grounds via an order dated July 15, 2021. On August 24, 2021, Petitioner re-filed its petition, basing it on the district court's order denying Petitioner's motion to dismiss the third amended complaint (on the very same basis as its denial of Petitioner's motion to dismiss the earlier complaint).

1 settings, such reasonable professional courtesies cannot be used to deprive parties
2 of effective relief. And here, discovery has ended, dispositive motion practice has
3 begun, and trial is set for May 23, 2022.

4 Petitioner leaves Real Party in Interest's request to the Court's discretion, but
5 requests that any extension not interfere with the timely consideration of the writ
6 relief requested, particularly in light of the upcoming trial date.

7 DATED this 14th day of January, 2022.

8 PISANELLI BICE PLLC

9
10 By: /s/ Todd L. Bice

11 James J. Pisanelli, Esq., #4027

12 Todd L. Bice, Esq., #4534

13 Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., #9695

14 Jordan T. Smith, Esq., #12097

400 South 7th Street, Suite 300

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

15 *Attorneys for Petitioner Barrick Gold Corporation*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of Pisanelli Bice PLLC, and that on this 14th day of January, 2022, I electronically filed and served a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing **PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO REAL PARTY IN INTEREST'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE ANSWER TO PETITION** to all parties registered for service.

/s/ Kimberly Peets

An employee of Pisanelli Bice PLLC