

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RYAN WILLIAMS,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 83418

FILED

MAR 03 2022

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

ORDER DENYING MOTION

Respondent has filed a motion for a second extension of time to file the answering brief. As counsel for respondent has specifically been advised,¹ once a party receives a telephonic extension of time to perform an act, further extensions of time to perform that same act are barred unless the moving party files a motion for an extension of time demonstrating extraordinary and compelling circumstances in support of the requested extension. NRAP 26(b)(1)(B); NRAP 31(b)(3)(A)(iv). Respondent previously received a telephonic extension of time to file the answering brief and does not demonstrate extraordinary and compelling circumstances warranting a second extension. Accordingly, the motion is denied. Respondent shall have until March 7, 2022, to file and serve the answering brief. Failure to timely file and serve the answering brief may result in the imposition of sanctions.

It is so ORDERED.

, C.J.

¹*Whitfield v. State*, Docket No. 78738 (Order, January 17, 2020); *Lewis v. State*, Docket No. 78757 (Order Granting Motion, December 3, 2019).

cc: Washoe County Public Defender
Attorney General/Carson City
Washoe County District Attorney