

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SANDS CHINA LTD.,
Petitioner,

vs.

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

Respondents,

and

STEVEN C. JACOBS,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 68265

FILED

JUL 08 2015

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

SANDS CHINA LTD., A CAYMAN
ISLANDS CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

vs.

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

Respondents,

and

STEVEN C. JACOBS,
Real Party in Interest.

No. 68275

LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP., A NEVADA
CORPORATION; SANDS CHINA LTD.,
A CAYMAN ISLANDS CORPORATION;
AND SHELDON G. ADELSON, AN
INDIVIDUAL,

Petitioners,

vs.

No. 68309

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE
ELIZABETH GOFF GONZALEZ,
DISTRICT JUDGE,
Respondents,
and
STEVEN C. JACOBS,
Real Party in Interest.

ORDER

On July 1, 2015, we entered an order that granted in part a motion to stay proceedings in the district court. With the exception of a specific deposition, our order stated in part that “discovery is otherwise *not* stayed and may continue as to all parties.” Petitioner Sands China Ltd. has now filed a motion to clarify our July 1, 2015, order, asserting that it appears that this court “overlooked the stay regarding [Sands China Ltd.] that was entered on June 23,” and asking this court to “confirm” that Sands China Ltd. is excepted from the term “all parties” with respect to the continuation of discovery.¹ Our July 1, 2015, order was clear: discovery may continue as to *all* parties. Accordingly, we deny the

¹The motion was deemed an “emergency,” apparently because counsel desired an “immediate” resolution. Motions treated as emergencies are governed by the strict criteria set forth in NRAP 27(e), which do not apply to the situation here. If counsel desires expedited relief but there is not a specific event scheduled in less than 14 days that counsel is moving to prevent, *id.*, counsel should file a motion for expedited relief or similar, but should not deem the motion an “emergency.”

motion, without prejudice to any party's right to make appropriate challenges to discovery in the future, if legally warranted.²

It is so ORDERED.

Hardesty C.J.
Hardesty

Douglas, J.
Douglas

Cherry, J.
Cherry

Saitta, J.
Saitta

Gibbons, J.
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Elizabeth Goff Gonzalez, District Judge
Alan M. Dershowitz
Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP
Holland & Hart LLP/Las Vegas
Morris Law Group
Pisanelli Bice, PLLC
Eighth District Court Clerk

²The motion also requests clarification regarding the due date for the reply in support of the petition filed in Docket No. 68265. We clarify that petitioners may file a reply within 11 days of the answer being served.