1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

25

26

27

28

DECLARATION OF DAVID T. WALL

I, David T. Wall, make this declaration pursuant to NRS 53.045:

- 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada and I am a partner in the law firm of Eglet Wall, which represents the respondents in the consolidated appeals entitled Jenny Rish v. William Jay Simao, et al., pending in the Nevada Supreme Court as Case Nos. 58504, 59208, and 59423.
- 2. I make this declaration on my own personal knowledge in support of respondents' Motion for Leave to File Brief in Excess of Type-Volume Limitations.
- 3. The proposed answering brief is a joint effort between myself and appellate counsel with over 30 years of appellate experience. Appellate counsel and myself have edited the brief several times, a process that has resulted in a substantial reduction of the brief's overall size.
- The brief currently consists of 26,556 words, but over 8,000 of 4. these words are expended in setting forth the facts necessary to properly consider the substantial evidence questions raised in appellant's opening brief.
- 5. Additionally, the opening brief consists of 20,136 words and provides little in the way of factual development of the substantial evidence questions raised in such brief.
- 6. In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the extra volume in respondents' answering brief is necessary to respond to the issues raised on appeal and will be of assistance to the court.

DATED this 18th day of January, 2013.

s/ David T. Wall

Nevada State Bar Ńo. 2805 400 South Fourth Street, Suite 600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA	
2	JENNY RISH,	
3	Appellant,	Case Nos. 58504 59208 59423
4	vs.	Electronically Filed
5 6	WILLIAM JAY SIMAO, individually; and CHERYL ANN SIMAO, individually and as husband and wife,	Jan 18 2013 09:46 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court
7	Respondents.)
8	MOTION FOR I FAVE TO) FILE POIEE
9	MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF IN EXCESS OF TYPE-VOLUME LIMITATIONS	
10	Respondents, acting by and through their counsel, David T. Wall, of the	
11	law firm of Eglet Wall, and hereby move the Court to enter its order granting	
12	them leave to file an answering brief that exceeds the type-volume limitations	
13	prescribed by NRAP 28(a)(7)(A)(ii), to wit: a brief containing 26,556 words.	
14	This motion is made pursuant to NRAP 32(a)(7)(D) and is based on the	
15	Declaration of David T. Wall, annexed hereto as Exhibit 1.	
16	DATED this 18 th day of January, 2013.	
17]	EGLET WALL
18		s/ David T. Wall
19		DAVID T. WALL, ESQ.
20		Nevada State Bar No. 2805
21		400 South Fourth Street, Suite 600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Respondents
22	•	Auomeys for Respondents
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EGLET WALL 400 South Fourth Street Suite 600 Las Vegas, NV 89101 (702) 450-5400

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

FACTS

Appellant's opening brief consists of 20,136 words. It raises two substantial evidence issues, to wit: 1) the sufficiency of the evidence to support the imposition of sanctions; and 2) the sufficiency of the evidence to support the award of damages. Yet, appellant has set forth almost none of the massive evidence that must be considered in deciding these issues.

Respondents' answering brief consists of 26,556 words. But it must be emphasized that over 8,000 of these words are used in the Statement of the Facts, setting forth the evidence that should have been described to the court by appellant. Thus, the words actually devoted to respondents' legal argument are less than the number of words contained in appellant's opening brief.

Furthermore, respondents' counsel have been diligent in editing the answering brief. The assistance of experienced appellate counsel was enlisted and several rounds of editing were undertaken, resulting in a substantial reduction in the brief's overall content.

In these circumstances, it is respectfully submitted that respondents have met the standards required by this court's rules.

ARGUMENT

NRAP 32(a)(7)(D) provides that a request to file a brief in excess of the page and type-volume limits may be granted upon a showing of diligence and good cause. Respondents respectfully submit that the facts set forth above establish such diligence and good cause for the modest request to increase the type-volume limitation. It is further submitted that respondents' answering brief, as presently constituted, will be of assistance to the court in its disposition of this appeal.

///

CONCLUSION For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Motion for Leave to File Brief in Excess of Type-Volume Limitations, to wit: an answering brief of 26,556 words, should be granted. DATED this 18th day of January, 2013. **EGLET WALL** s/ David T. Wall DAVID T. WALL, ESQ. Nevada State Bar No. 2805

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 2 I HEREBY CERTIFY that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on the 18th day of January, 2013. Electronic service 3 of the foregoing Motion for Leave to File Brief in Excess of Type-Volume 4 Limitations shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as 5 6 follows: Daniel F. Polsenberg, Esq. Joel D. Henriod, Esq. 7 8 LEWIS AND ROCA, LLP 3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Suite 600 9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 I FURTHER CERTIFY that, on the 18th day of January, 2013, pursuant 10 to NRAP 25(c)(1)(B), I caused a true copy of the foregoing Motion for Leave 11 12 to File Brief in Excess of Type-Volume Limitations to be placed in an envelope, with postage prepaid, and deposited in the United States Mail in Las 13 14 Vegas, Nevada, addressed to: Stephen H. Rogers, Esq. ROGERS MASTRANGELO 15 16 CARVALHO & MITCHELL 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 170 17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 18 s/ Nick Vaglio 19 An Employee of EGLET WALL 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28