

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

DAISY TRUST, A NEVADA TRUST,

Appellant,

v.

SUNRISE RIDGE MASTER
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION;
AND NEVADA ASSOCIATION
SERVICES, INC., A NEVADA NON-
PROFIT CORPORATION,

Respondents.

Supreme Court Docket No. 83798

Electronically Filed
Jun 13 2022 03:45 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE REPLY BRIEF

(Second Request, following prior Telephonic Extension)

COMES NOW, Appellant, DAISY TRUST, A NEVADA TRUST, (“Daisy”) by and through its attorneys, ROGER P. CROTEAU & ASSOCIATES, LTD., and hereby presents its Motion to Extend Time to File Reply Brief, requesting a second extension (beyond that previously granted by a telephonic extension) of time to thirty (30) days from the current deadline of June 15, 2022, or until such other date that the court deems appropriate. This Motion is made and based upon the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the attached exhibits, the declaration of counsel, and all papers and pleadings on file herein.

Dated this 13th day of June, 2022.

ROGER P. CROTEAU & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

/s/ Christopher L. Benner, Esq.

Roger P. Croteau, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 4958

Christopher L. Benner, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8963

2810 West Charleston Blvd., Suite 75

Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

Attorney for Appellant

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

A. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

1. Daisy caused the instant appeal to be filed on November 18, 2021.
2. On November 23, 2021, this Court assigned this matter to the Settlement Program.
3. On December 14, 2021, this Court issued an Order Removing Case from Settlement Program and Reinstating Briefing schedule.
4. Daisy submitted the Opening Brief and Joint Appendix on March 28, 2022.
5. Respondent Sunrise Ridge Master Homeowners Association filed their Answering Brief on April 27, 2022.
6. Respondent Nevada Association Services, Inc., obtained an extension until May 11, 2022, to file their Answering Brief.

7. Respondent Nevada Association Services filed a Joinder to Sunrise Ridge Master Homeowners Association's Answering Brief on May 2, 2022.
8. On May 26, 2022, this Court issued the decision in *Saticoy Bay, LLC v. Thornburg Mortg. Sec. Tr. 2007-3*, No. 80111, 2022 Nev. LEXIS 32 (May 26, 2022)("Innisbrook Matter").
9. On May 27, 2022, Daisy requested and obtained a two-week extension by telephonic request to extend the time to file and serve the Reply Brief until June 15, 2022.
10. In light of the issuance of the decision in the Innisbrook Matter, Daisy is evaluating whether the current Appeal can be continued, or if the Innisbrook Matter addressed all applicable issues, and has reached out to the Respondents to determine how best to resolve the matter.
11. Daisy is aware that the appellant in the Innisbrook Matter is seeking rehearing.
12. Daisy is requesting an extension of 30 days in which to file its Reply Brief, or otherwise resolve the matter, after the currently set deadline of June 15, 2022, namely, to July 15, 2022.
13. No prior extensions have been denied, in whole or in part.

B. STATEMENT OF THE LAW

NRAP 31(b) provides in pertinent part as follows:

(2) Stipulations. Unless the court orders otherwise, in all appeals except child custody, visitation, or capital cases, the parties may extend the time for filing any brief for a total of 30 days beyond the due dates set forth in Rule 31(a)(1) by filing a written stipulation with the clerk of the Supreme Court on or before the brief's due date. No extensions of time by stipulation are permitted in child custody, visitation, or capital cases.

(3) Motions for Extensions of Time. A motion for extension of time for filing a brief may be made no later than the due date for the brief and must comply with the provisions of this Rule and Rule 27.

(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 14-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 (including demonstrating extraordinary and compelling circumstances under Rule 26(b)(1)(B), if required; and

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

C. ARGUMENT

As set forth above, Daisy's counsel seeks to obtain an extension of the due date for the Reply Brief that is presently due on June 15, 2022, and was originally due on June 1, 2022. This is not a child custody, visitation, or capital case. This is the second extension of time that has been requested, excluding the prior telephonic request. The prior telephonic request was granted. The requested length of the extension is for thirty (30) days. The reasons are set forth below.

This matter concerns a homeowners association sale which occurred following a tender of a superpriority amount for a lien. Following the submission of the Opening Brief by Daisy and Answering Briefs by the Respondents, Daisy's counsel became aware of the decision in the Innisbrook Matter. Daisy's counsel is in communication with Daisy's principal and Respondents' counselors, and is seeking to determine if the underlying issue in this matter has been resolved by way of the Innisbrook Matter, and a possible resolution of this matter. However, no such resolution has been finalized at this date. Thus, Daisy seeks an additional 30 days, until July 15, 2022, to determine the applicability of the Innisbrook Matter and to finalize any resolution, if possible, or submit a Reply Brief in this matter.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, Daisy respectfully requests that the deadline to file the Reply Brief be extended an additional 30 days, to July 15, 2022, or another date that the Court deems appropriate.

Dated this 13th day of June, 2022.

ROGER P. CROTEAU & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

/s/ Christopher L. Benner, Esq.

Roger P. Croteau, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 4958

Christopher L. Benner, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8963

2810 West Charleston Blvd., Suite 75

Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

Attorney for Appellant

DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER L. BENNER

CHRISTOPHER L. BENNER, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that:

1. That I am an attorney for the Appellant, Daisy Trust, a Nevada Trust (“Daisy”), in the above-captioned matter.
2. Of the following facts, I know them to be true of my own knowledge unless stated upon information and belief, in which case I possess a good faith belief that such facts are true and correct.
3. Daisy caused the instant appeal to be filed on November 18, 2021.
4. On December 14, 2021, this Court issued an Order Removing Case from Settlement Program and Reinstating Briefing schedule.
5. Daisy submitted the Opening Brief and Joint Appendix on March 28, 2022.

6. Respondent Sunrise Ridge Master Homeowners Association filed their Answering Brief on April 27, 2022.
7. Respondent Nevada Association Services, Inc., obtained an extension until May 11, 2022, to file their Answering Brief.
8. Respondent Nevada Association Services filed a Joinder to Sunrise Ridge Master Homeowners Association's Answering Brief on May 2, 2022.
9. On May 26, 2022, this Court issued the decision in *Saticoy Bay, LLC v. Thornburg Mortg. Sec. Tr. 2007-3*, No. 80111, 2022 Nev. LEXIS 32 (May 26, 2022).
10. On May 27, 2022, Daisy requested and obtained a two week extension by telephonic request to extend the time to file and serve the Reply Brief until June 15, 2022.
11. In light of the issuance of the decision in the Innisbrook Matter, Daisy is evaluating whether the current Appeal can be continued, or if the Innisbrook Matter addressed all applicable issues, and has reached out to the Respondents to determine how best to resolve the matter.
12. Daisy is aware that the appellant in the Innisbrook Matter is seeking rehearing.
13. Daisy is requesting an extension of 30 days in which to file its Reply Brief, or otherwise resolve the matter, after the currently set deadline of June 15, 2022, namely, to July 15, 2022.
14. No prior extensions have been denied.
15. I have contacted counsel for Respondents Nevada Association Services and Sunrise Ridge Master Homeowners Association; neither stated an opposition to the requested extension as set forth in this Motion.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In accordance with NRAP 25, I hereby certify that on June 13, 2022, I caused a copy of the **MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPLY BRIEF (Second Request)** to be filed and served electronically via the Court's E-Flex System to the following:

BRANDON E. WOOD, ESQ.
6625 S. Valley View Blvd, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
Attorney for Nevada Association Services

J. WILLIAM EBERT, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 2697
JONATHAN K. WONG, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 13621
9900 Covington Cross Drive, Suite 120
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144
Attorneys for Sunrise Ridge

/s/ Joe Koehle
An Employee of ROGER P. CROTEAU &
ASSOCIATES