## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RUBY DUNCAN, and individual; RABBI MEL HECHT, an individual; *et al.*,

Appellants,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA OFFICE OF THE STATE TREASURER; THE STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; et al.,

Respondents,

and

AIMEE HAIRR, an individual, et al.,

Respondent-Intervenors.

Electronically Filed
Supreme Court Gase \$12070508:54 p.m.
Tracie K. Lindeman
District Court Note of Supreme Court

Respondent-Intervenors'
Unopposed Motion to Divide
Argument

MATTHEW T. DUSHOFF, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 004975 **KOLESAR & LEATHAM** 400 S. Rampart Blvd., Ste. 400 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Telephone: (702) 362-7800 Facsimile: (702) 362-9472

mdushoff@klnevada.com

Attorneys for Respondent-Intervenors.

Timothy D. Keller\* (AZ Bar No. 019844) Keith E. Diggs\* (WA Bar No. 48492)

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE 398 S. Mill Ave., Ste. 301 Tempe, Arizona 85281 Telephone: (480) 557-8300

Facsimile: (480) 557-8305

TKeller@ij.org kdiggs@ij.org

\*Admitted *Pro Hac Vice* below; applications forthcoming

Attorneys for Respondent-Intervenors.

# RESPONDENT-INTERVENORS' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO DIVIDE ARGUMENT

Respondent-Intervenors Aimee Hairr, Aurora Espinoza, Elizabeth Robbins, Lara Allen, Jeffrey Smith, and Trina Smith hereby move to divide oral argument. Counsel for Parents have spoken with counsel for both Appellants and the State Respondents, who do not oppose this division of argument time.

# **RELIEF SOUGHT**

Respondent-Intervenors seek an order dividing oral argument, presently slated to last 60 minutes, between the above-captioned parties as follows:

- Appellants: ...... 30 minutes.
- Respondent-Intervenors: ...... 7 ½ minutes.

#### **ARGUMENT**

This case asks whether the ESA program set up by SB 302 (2015) violates either of two provisions of the Nevada Constitution. Nev. Const. art. 11, §§ 2, 10. Granting this motion will assist the Court by providing a complete perspective on the issues raised. Although Respondent-Intervenors and the State both urge affirmance of the district court, they have separate interests: the State is charged with implementation of the ESA program, whereas Respondent-Intervenors are primarily concerned with the educational upbringing of their children.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Parents respectfully request that the Court issue an order dividing argument time as described above.

Respectfully submitted this 15<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2016 by:

## **KOLESAR & LEATHAM**

/s/ Matthew T. Dushoff, Esq.

MATTHEW T. DUSHOFF, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 004975 400 S. Rampart Blvd., Ste. 400 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

Telephone: (702) 362-7800 Facsimile: (702) 362-9472 mdushoff@klnevada.com

-and-

Timothy D. Keller\* (AZ Bar No. 019844) Keith E. Diggs\* (WA Bar No. 48492)

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

398 S. Mill Ave., Ste. 301 Tempe, Arizona 85281

Telephone: (480) 557-8300

Facsimile: (480) 557-8305

TKeller@ij.org kdiggs@ij.org

\*Admitted *Pro Hac Vice* below;

applications forthcoming

Attorneys for Respondent-Intervenors

#### CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that this Motion complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 27(d), the typeface requirements of NRAP 27(d)(1), and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this Motion has been prepared in a proportionally-spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2010 in 14-point Times New Roman font. This filing also complies with NRAP 32. I further certify that I have read this Response and that it complies with the page or type-volume limitations of NRAP 27(d)(2) and NRAP 32 because, it is proportionately spaced, and does not exceed 10 pages.

Finally, I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I further certify that this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e)(1), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by appropriate references to the record on appeal. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2016.

/s/ Matthew T. Dushoff, Esq.
MATTHEW T. DUSHOFF, ESQ.

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I am an employee of Kolesar & Leatham, and that on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2016, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Respondent-Intervenors' Unopposed Motion to Divide Argument** with the Clerk of the Court for the Nevada Supreme Court by using the appellate CM/ECF system.

The following participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

Attorney General of the State of Nevada

Adam Paul Laxalt Lawrence VanDyke Joseph Tartakovsky Ketan D. Bhirud lvandyke@ag.nv.gov jtartakovsky@ag.nv.gov kbhirud@ag.nv.gov Attorneys for Respondents **Hutchison & Steffen, LLC** 

Mark A. Hutchison, Esq.
Jacob Reynolds, Esq.
Robert Stewart, Esq.
mhutchison@hutchlegal.com
jreynolds@hutchlegal.com
rstewart@hutchlegal.com
Attorneys for Respondents

American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada

Amy Rose, Esq. rose@aclunv.org
Attorneys for Appellants

I further certify and affirm that I caused this document to be deposited via USPS first class mail, the following parties:

Nitin Subhedar Samuel Jacob Edwards COVINGTON & BURLING LLP One Front Street, 35th Floor Daniel Mach Heather L. Weaver AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION San Francisco, California 94111-5356 Attorneys for Appellants

Anupam Sharma COVINGTON & BURLING LLP 333 Twin Dolphin Dr., Suite 700 Redwood Shores, CA 94065 Attorneys for Appellants 915 15th Street NW, Ste. 600 Washington, D.C. 20005 Attorneys for Appellants

Richard B. Katskee
AMERICANS UNITED FOR
SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND
STATE
1901 L Street NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
Attorneys for Appellants

/s/ Kristina R. Cole
An Employee of KOLESAR & LEATHAM