

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ROWEN A. SEIBEL; MOTI PARTNERS,
LLC; MOTI PARTNERS 16, LLC; LLTQ
ENTERPRISES, LLC; LLTQ
ENTERPRISES 16, LLC; TPOV
ENTERPRISES, LLC; TPOV 16
ENTERPRISES, LLC; FERG, LLC;
FERG 16, LLC; R SQUARED GLOBAL
SOLUTIONS, LLC; DNT ACQUISITION,
LLC; GR BURGR, LLC; AND CRAIG
GREEN,
Petitioners,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
TIMOTHY C. WILLIAMS, DISTRICT
JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

DESERT PALACE, INC.; PARIS LAS
VEGAS OPERATING COMPANY, LLC;
PHWLTV, LLC; AND BOARDWALK
REGENCY CORPORATION,
Real Parties in Interest.

No. 83723

FILED

DEC 28 2021

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

*ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE ANSWER
AND DENYING MOTION REGARDING DISTRICT COURT MINUTES*

This original petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order granting a motion to compel disclosure of documents that petitioners assert are protected by the attorney-client privilege. On November 10, 2021, we directed real parties in interest to file an answer. The parties have filed a joint motion seeking to extend the time

to file the answer. That motion is granted; real parties in interest shall have until January 5, 2022, to file and serve the answer.

Further, petitioners have moved to preclude, pending a decision on the writ petition, real parties in interest from using the district court's August 19, 2021, minutes, in which the court disclosed some of the subject information, for any purpose, including in responding to the writ petition. Petitioners acknowledge that the district court has already precluded the minutes' use pending a decision on the writ petition except for purposes of responding to the writ petition or an appeal but assert that the district court should not have disclosed the information before they were afforded an opportunity to seek review and that its order does not fully remedy the premature disclosure. Real parties in interest oppose the motion, arguing that the minutes reflect the district court's reasoning, which should remain open; that in light of the district court's decision, further nondisclosure is not mandated by law; and that petitioners waived any clawback argument by failing to ask them to sequester the minutes and by placing the minutes at issue in this court. Petitioners have filed a reply. Having considered the parties' arguments, we deny the motion; real parties in interest may use the August minutes for purposes of responding to this petition, as petitioners placed the minutes at issue in the petition.

It is so ORDERED.

Cadish, J.
Cadish

Pickering, J.
Pickering

Herndon, J.
Herndon

cc: Hon. Timothy C. Williams, District Judge
Bailey Kennedy
Pisanelli Bice, PLLC
Eighth District Court Clerk