1	IN THE SUPREME COURT C	OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
2	HONORABLE JUDGE CATHERINE RAMSEY, NORTH LAS VEGAS	SUPREME COURT NO. 68450
3	MUNICIPAL JUDGE,	
4	Appellant,	Electronically Filed Aug 25 2015 02:50 p.m. Tracie K. Lindeman
5	vs. THE CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS	Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court
7	AND BARBARA A. ANDOLINA City Clerk of NORTH LAS VEGAS, BETTY	
8	HAMILTON, MICHAEL WILLIAM	
9	MORENO, and BOB BORGERSEN,	
	individually and as Members of	
10	"REMOVE RAMSEY NOW,"	
11	Respondents.	
12	1	
13		
14		
15	RESPONDENT BETTY HAMILTON	MICHAEL WILLIAM MORENO.
16	RESPONDENT BETTY HAMILTON AND BOB BORGERSEN'S MOTION SUPPLEMENT TO THE WRIT PETI	TION NOW IDENTIFIED AS THE
17	APPEAL OPENING BRIEF AND	REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS
18		
19	Respectfully Submitted by:	
20	GENTILE CRISTALLI MILLER	
21	ARMENI & SAVARESE DOMINIC P. GENTILE	
22	Nevada Bar No. 1923 ROSS MILLER Nevada Bar No. 8190	
23	COLLEEN E. MCCARTY Nevada Bar No. 13186	
24	410 South Rampart Boulevard, Suite 420 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145	
25	Tel: (702) 880-0000 Fax: (702) 778-9709	
26	Attorneys for Respondents Betty Hamilton, Michael William Moreno,	
27	and Bob Borgersen	

Gentile Cristalli Miller Armeni Savarese Attorneys At Law 410 S. Rampart Blvd., #420 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 (702) 880-0000

1 of 6

Gentile Cristalli Miller Armeni Savarese Attorneys At Law 10 S. Rampart Blvd., #420 as Vegas, Nevada 89145 (702) 880-0000

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I.

INTRODUCTION

Following the Court's issuance of an order to Appellant Judge Catherine Ramsey ("Judge Ramsey") to show cause why her original petition for writ relief should not be denied due to the challenged order being substantively appealable, Judge Ramsey did two things. She filed a Notice of Appeal on July 21, 2015, and she filed Petitioner's Response to Supreme Court Order to Show Cause on July 22, 2015. In her response, Judge Ramsey specifically requested that this Court "treat the writ petition as the opening brief in the appeal docket in order to save time for the briefing process."

In its Order thereafter dated July 27, 2015, the Court granted Judge Ramsey's request, which was not qualified in any way and, in fact, resulted in the filing of an opening brief that is well in excess of the Court's limitations on brief length, without obtaining leave from the Court. Further, the Court permitted Judge Ramsey to "supplement the record," not submit an entirely new opening brief. This fact notwithstanding, Judge Ramsey has now filed what she styled as a

Petitioner's Response to Supreme Court Order to Show Cause was originally filed in Docket No. Case No. 68394 as Document No. 15-22155. By Order dated July 27, 2015, the Court denied the petition in Docket No. 68394 and directed the Clerk of the Court to transfer all documents to the instant Docket No. 68450. Petitioner's Response is now Document No. 15-22697 in Docket No. 68450, and the quoted language appears on page 16 therein.

² See July 27, 2015 Order at p. 3.

Supplement to the Writ Petition Now Identified as the Appeal Opening Brief, which is in excess of fifty (50) pages, also without leave of the Court. For all of the reasons that follow, Respondents Betty Hamilton, Michael William Moreno, and Bob Borgersen (collectively "Respondents") ask the Court at this time to direct the Clerk of the Court to immediately strike Judge Ramsey's unauthorized Supplement to the Writ Petition Now Identified as the Appeal Opening Brief and award sanctions in the form of attorney's fees and costs for the need to bring the instant motion.

II.

ARGUMENT

NRAP 32(a)(7)(A)(i) limits an appellant's opening brief to a length of either thirty (30) pages or 14,000 words, and NRAP 32(a)(7)(D) advises that requests to exceed the allowable brief length are disfavored and will only be granted upon motion that shows diligence and good cause.

Respondents anticipate Judge Ramsey will seek to argue that the Court authorized supplemental briefing in its Order dated July 27, 2015. In fact, what the Court authorized in response to Judge Ramsey's request to use her writ petition as her opening brief to save time, was the opportunity to supplement the record on appeal; nothing was said about supplemental briefing.

NRAP 10 sets forth what constitutes the record on appeal. It is a precise word in appellate practice with precise requirements, which consist of the appendix

and any exhibits which cannot be copied to be included in the appendix. In no way can an authorization to supplement the record be confused with an authorization to supplement an already excessively long opening brief. Moreover, the Court calculated the timing of Respondent's answering brief from the date of its Order and acceptance of Judge Ramsey's offer to treat her writ petition as her opening brief, not from the date allowed to supplement the record. Judge Ramsey's willful disregard of the rules for filing briefs, as well as the plain language of the Court's Order dated July 27, 2015, should not be tolerated and should subject her to sanctions.

Finally, if Judge Ramsey is allowed to file her Supplement to the Writ Petition Now Identified as the Appeal Opening Brief, she will essentially be given two bites at the apple. The admission of this additional briefing would effectively expand the argument in favor of Judge Ramsey's position to ninety-four pages, nearly triple the thirty-page limit Respondents enjoy. It is clear that Respondents would be unfairly prejudiced for this reason, as well as being burdened with having to research and prepare a response to Judge Ramsey's Supplement to the Writ Petition Now Identified as the Appeal Opening Brief.

III.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that this Court strike Judge Ramsey's Supplement to the Writ Petition Now Identified as the

1	Appeal Opening Brief and sanction Judge Ramsey and her counsel of record for
2	such willful disregard of NRAP 32 and the Court's direct order.
3	Dated this 25th day of August, 2015.
4	Dated this day of August, 2015.
5	GENTILE, CRISTALLI, MILLER ARMENI & SAVARESE
6	ARWIEN & SAVARESE
7	Collen E. Mola ()
8	DOMINIC P. GENTICE Nevada Bar No. 1923
9	ROSS MILLER Nevada Bar No. 8190 COLLEEN E. MCCARTY
10	Nevada Bar No. 13186
11	Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
12	410 South Rampart Boulevard, Suite 420 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Tel: (702) 880-0000 Attorneys for Respondents Betty Hamilton, Michael William Moreno, and Bob Borgersen
13	Moreno, and Bob Borgersen
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

TEDTIFICATE OF SEDVICE

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	The undersigned, an employee of Gentile Cristalli Miller Armeni &
3	Savarese, hereby certifies that on the
4	copy of the RESPONDENT MICHAEL BETTY HAMILTON, MICHAEL
5	WILLIAM MORENO, AND BOB BORGERSEN'S MOTION TO STRIKE
6	APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENT TO THE WRIT PETITION NOW
7	IDENTIFIED AS THE APPEAL OPENING BRIEF AND REQUEST FOR
8	SANCTIONS, by Electronic Service with the Nevada Supreme Court in
9	accordance with the Master Service List, and by placing said copy in an envelope
10	postage fully prepaid, in the U.S. Mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, said envelope
11	addressed to:
12	Craig A. Mueller, Esq.
13	Mueller, Hinds & Associates
14	600 S. Eighth Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
15	cmueller@muellerhinds.com
16	Attorneys for Honorable Catherine Ramsey

Richard C. Gordon, Esq.

Daniel S. Ivie, Esq.

Snell & Wilmer

3883 Howard Hughes Pkwy, #600 20

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

rgordon@swlaw.com 21

divie@swlaw.com 22

23

North Las Vegas Municipal Court Judge

Attorneys for The City of North Las Vegas, and Barbara Andolina, City Clerk of the City of North Las Vegas

GENTILE, CRISTALLI, MILLER,

ARMENI & SAVARESÉ

27

24

25

26

17

18

19

28